This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

BH 12037.3

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY



LIFE AND TIMES

OF

HENRY GRATTAN.

VOL. V.

MEMOIRS

OF THE

LIFE AND TIMES

OF THE

RT. HON. HENRY GRATTAN.

BY HIS SON,

HENRY GRATTAN, ESQ., M.P.

Non de Tyranno sed de cive, non de domino sed de Parente loquimur.
C. PLINIUS.

And you, brave Cobham! to the latest breath
Shall feel your ruling passion strong in death,
Such in these moments as in all the past,
"*Oh, save my country, Heaven!*" shall be your last.
POPE.

VOL. V.

LONDON:
HENRY COLBURN, PUBLISHER,
GREAT MARLBOROUGH STREET.

1846.

Bv12037.3
9482.13

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
1860, March 10

London;
Printed by STEWART and MURRAY,
Old Bailey.

CONTENTS

OF

THE CHAPTERS IN VOLUME V.

CHAPTER I.

Ministers of George III. and Queen Elizabeth compared.—Policy of England towards Ireland.—Influence of the Crown in the Irish Parliament.—The superior advantages possessed by Ireland.—Conduct of the Irish Parliament.—Probability of a Union.—The proceedings of the Irish Government justified the course pursued by Mr. Grattan.—Inevitable consequence of their proceedings.—Sketch of the events that led to the Union.—Natural consequences.—Means adopted by Government.—Secret Service Money.—Sir John Parnell and James Fitzgerald dismissed from their offices for opposing the Union.—Letter of Mr. Fitzgerald to the Bar.—Their conduct.—Meeting and Resolutions as to the Union.—Meeting of Parliament, 22nd January, 1799.—Mr. Ponsonby's amendment against Union lost only by one!—Mr. Plunket's speech.—Sir Lawrence Parson's amendment against the Union carried on the 24th by five majority.—Union Paragraph rejected.—Great joy of the Irish People.—Addresses to the Members.—Mr. Saurin's reply.—The Regency Bill proposed by Mr. Fitzgerald.—Mr. Foster's (Speaker) speech against the Union . . Page 1

CHAPTER II.

Military force in Ireland at the period of the Union.—Martial law.—Cruel sentence on Devereux.—Indemnity bill.—Cases of torture known by the Government-Trials.—Acquittal of Judkin Fitzgerald.—Lord Avonmore's charge.—Mr. Barrington's resignation as lieutenant of yeomanry.—Escheatorship refused to Colonel Cole.—Arts practised by Government.—Speeches of Plunket, Moore, and Ponsonby.—Ponsonby's attack on Lord Castlereagh.—House of Lords.—Amend-

ment proposed by Lord Powerscourt against the Union.—Last letter of Lord Charlemont.—His death.—End of session of 1799.—Conduct of Lord Cornwallis.—Addresses in favour of Union.—Lord Donoughmore's conduct.—Orange Lodges hostile to Union.—Divisions sown among them and the Catholics.—Offers to the Roman Catholic clergy.—Resolution of the prelates.—Veto.—Catholics grossly duped.—Anecdote of Lord Cornwallis by Judge Johnson.—Catholics adverse to the Union.—Meeting and speech of Mr. Daniel O'Connell, barrister, against it.—Resolutions on the subject . . Page 31

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Grattan's difficulty of getting a seat in Parliament.—Conduct of opposition.—Peter Burrowes's plan to appeal to yeomanry.—Sheridan's words on the Union.—Arthur Wellesley's (Duke of Wellington) opinion on Union.—Mr. Foster's difficulty as to the Catholics.—Letter from Lord Downshire and Charlemont.—Three plans for opposing the Union; purchasing seats; writing pamphlets; personal conduct.—Mr. Grattan elected for the town of Wicklow.—Going to the House.—Parting with Mrs. Grattan.—*Her spirited words.*—Sir Lawrence Parson's amendment.—Speeches of Plunket, Fitzgerald, Moore, Ponsonby, and Bushe.—Mr. Grattan's entrance into the House.—Sensation produced.—His appearance and conduct.—Speaks.—Corry attacks him.—Arbitrary conduct of Government.—Post troops at the Houses of Parliament.—Meetings of the people stopped by the military.—Major Rogers threatens to blow the Court House about the ears of the freeholders in the King's County, 5th Feb.—Mr. Grattan's speech against Union.—Attacked a second time by Corry.—Government press on the question.—No regard paid to the Committee on Trade and Manufactures.—House in Committee.—Mr. Corry attacks Mr. Grattan.—His reply.—They leave the House.—Corry's character and conduct.—Corry's friendship.—His verses on Mr. Grattan.—Account of the duel by Mr. Grattan.—Sheriff held by General Cradock till the parties fought . . . . . Page 63

CHAPTER IV.

Effect of the duel between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Corry on the supporters of the Union.—Case of bribery, 5,000 guineas paid.—Some could not be bribed.—Mr. Hardy.—His character.—Rejects all offers.—Charles Kendal Bushe.—His character.—Rejects all offers from Lord Castlereagh.—Peter Burrowes incorruptible.—His character and conduct.—Speech of Mr. Saurin against the Union—His character and conduct.—Foster's speech.—His character and conduct.—Lord Cornwallis's letter to Lord Mornington.—Remarks upon it.—Mr. George Ponsonby's motion.—Impatience of Government.—Introduce two bills.—Insurrection and Rebellion bills.—Invest the Army with great powers.—Government propose to buy the House of Commons, and pay 15,000*l.* for each borough abolished.—Letter on the subject to the Marquis of Donegal.—Expenses of the Union.—Mr. Plunket's celebrated attack on Government for their corrupt practices.—Character of Mr. Plunket.—Character of Mr. Ponsonby.

—His motion to dissolve Parliament.—Sir John Parnell's speech.—Account of his family, the Poet and the Peer.—Remarkable words of Mr. Saurin and Sir Lawrence Parsons as to the Union.—Exchange of the militias of the two countries.—The Fitzgerald indemnity bill.—Proceedings of the House of Lords.—Speech of Lord Clare.—Attacks Mr. Grattan.—Publishes his Speech.—Mr. Grattan's celebrated answer, and brilliant description of the men of 1782 . Page 110

CHAPTER V.

Proceedings in the British Parliament on the Union.—Sheridan's exertions against it.—Lord Downshire on the offers to him from Government.—Lord Camden on the torture in Ireland.—Description of the Government supporters in the Irish Parliament in the Lower House.—St. George Daly, William Smith, Luke Fox, Robert Johnson, all created judges for their votes.—Society of the Monks of the Screw.—Dr. Frederick Jebb.—Johnson promoted.—Curran's great eulogium on Lord Avonmore.—Anecdote of him by Curran.—Dr. Arthur Browne killed by the Union.—In the upper House, Lord Pery, Lord Carleton, Lord Kilwarden, Lord Avonmore.—Anecdote of, by Curran.—His last speech in the House alluding to Mr. Grattan.—Lord Castlereagh.—His character and conduct.—Motion of Mr. O'Donnell that the placemen should go to the Lord Lieutenant with the address on the Union.—List of them.—Union Bill read a second time.—Mr. Grattan's speech.—Encomium on him by Mr. Burrowes.—Motion that the Union Bill be burned.—Bill passed the 7th of June.—Receives the Royal Assent on the 1st of August.—Speeches against the Union bought by Lord Castlereagh and burned . . Page 154

CHAPTER VI.

Mr. Pitt's opinion favourable to domestic legislation in Ireland.—His letter to the Duke of Rutland.—Remarks on the Union.—Acquisitions for Ireland gained by the Irish Parliament.—Results of the Union.—Effect on the Trade, Commerce, and Revenues of the Country.—Ireland became bankrupt.—Military force necessary for Ireland in 1782.—Forces kept up in 1840.—State of the people.—Parliamentary reports.—Destitute condition of the agricultural classes.—Original Red and Black Lists.—The speech and opinion of Mr. Fox on the Union.—Comparison between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox.—Their characters and their style of eloquence . . . Page 181

CHAPTER VII.

After the Union Mr. Grattan retires to Tinnehinch and gives up politics.—His mode of life.—Letter to Mr. Berwick.—Remark on Lord Clare's speech in the Imperial Parliament.—Lord Fitzwilliam urges Mr. Grattan to enter Parliament.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Signor Acerbi.—Remarks on Ireland.—Mr. Pitt and Lord Cornwallis retire from office.—Their reasons.—Memorandum produced by Lord Castlereagh on the subject.—Mr. Addington's administration.—Peace with the French Republic.—Emmett's insurrection in 1803.—His words and

death.—The Broken Heart, Moore's Melody.—Mr. M'Can's examination before the Privy Council.—Strange offers to him.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Mr. Wickham.—The paper regarding the United Irish Directory burned by Mr. Grattan.—Lord Fitzwilliam's letter to Mr. Grattan and Mr. Plowden.—His History and Remarks on Mr. Addington as to the Catholics.—Mr. Fox applies to Mr. Grattan on the affairs of Ireland.—His answer.—His yeomanry corps.—Reconciles Orangemen and Catholics.—Mr. Grattan's important letter to Mr. Fox.—Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan.—Hardy's Memoirs of Lord Charlemont . . . . . Page 210

CHAPTER VIII.

State of affairs on the continent of Europe in 1804 and 1805.—Conduct of Buonaparte.—His letter to the King.—Parties in Parliament.—Mr. Addington.—Mr. Pitt.—Letters of Lord Redesdale to Lord Fingall.—Mr. Grattan solicited to return to Parliament.—Mr. Fox's letters.—Mr. Pitt's conduct to the Catholics.—His message to Lord Hardwicke.—Proceedings of the Catholics.—Apply to Pitt.—Entrust their petition to Mr. Fox.—He moves on their petition.—Account of Mr. Grattan's speech in the Imperial Parliament.—Its success.—Pitt's remark.—Lord Byron's.—Letter to Mr. Grattan on the subject from Dr. O'Leary.—Lord Tyrawly.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Hardy and M'Can.—Breach between Pitt and Foster.—Mr. Grattan wishes to retire from Parliament.—Fox's letter.—Mr. Grattan to James Grattan on the study of history.—To Dr. Berwick.—Victory at Trafalgar.—To Mr. Plowden.—Irish history.—Death of Mr. Pitt.—Change of administration . . . . . Page 247

CHAPTER IX.

The Duke of Bedford sent to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant.—Conduct of the Whig administration.—Great expectations of the Irish people.—Disappointed.—Mr. Fox's remarks as to the repeal of the Union.—Treatment of Hardy and Curran.—Mr. Tierney.—His character.—Conduct of the Catholics.—Letter of Mr. Grattan.—Refuses office.—Mr. Fox's letteras to the Catholics.—Letter of the Lord Lieutenant.—Letter of Mr. Grattan on the study of history.—His to Mr. Berwick on Irish appointments.—To M'Can on ditto.—To Hamilton Rowan as to Mr. Sampson.—To M'Can as to Curran.—Fletcher and Hardy.—As to Mr. Fox's health.—Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan on the death of Fox.—Mr. Grattan to the Secretary of the Board of Education on that subject.—Sir John Newport on ditto.—General election.—Mr. Grattan declining Lord Fitzwilliam's offer to be returned for an English borough, sets up for Dublin.—Is elected.—His speech.—Letter of Mr. Keogh.—Ditto of Duke of Bedford.—Mrs. Grattan to Mr. Hartley, refusing the subscription to defray the expenses of election.—Lord Fitzwilliam to Mr. Grattan . . . Page 282

CHAPTER X.

The Duke of Bedford's letter on a provision for the Catholic clergy.—Mr. Grattan's opinion thereon.—Also Edmund Burke's.—Proceed-

ings of the Catholics as to their petition in 1807.—Mr. Ponsonby's opinion and letter thereon.—Meeting of the new Parliament.—Lord Grenville and Lord Howick continued in the ministry.—Remarks on their character.—The Catholic Military Bill at first approved of, then objected to, by the King.—The bill abandoned.—Unconstitutional pledge demanded by the King.—Refused.—They are dismissed.—Mr. Grattan's letter to the Duke of Bedford on the subject.—His letter to Lord Fingall on the Catholic petition.—Speech of Mr. Keogh.—Resolution in favour of the Duke of Bedford.—His reply.—Mr. Preston's death.—Mr. Hardy his successor.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Mr. Berwick.—No Popery administration.—Their conduct.—Their character.—Mr. Canning.—Mr. Perceval.—House of Commons desert the Whigs, and support Mr. Perceval's party.—Parliament dissolved.—Unconstitutional efforts of the Tories at the elections.—Great majority in their favour in the House of Commons.—Insurrection and Arms bill.—Mr. Grattan's conduct.—Mr. Sheridan's motion on the state of Ireland.—Speech of Mr. Grattan thereon.—His letters on the subject.—To Mr. Berwick and Mr. M'Can, and to H. Grattan, jun. Page 330

CHAPTER XI.

The Roman Catholic Proceedings in 1808.—Letters of Mr. Grattan thereon.—The Grant to the Catholic College of Maynooth reduced by the No-Popery administration.—Remarks thereon by Mr. Foster, Mr. Grattan, and Sir A. Wellesley (Secretary, afterwards Duke of Wellington).—The History of the Veto.—Efforts of Government to gain influence over the Catholic Church in 1782, 1795, 1799, 1806, and 1808.—The Object of Government.—Edmund Burke's opinions on this question.—Catholic Question brought forward by Mr. Grattan.—Dr. Milner's Communication with Mr. Ponsonby.—Veto as stated by him.—Milner retracts.—People of Ireland oppose Veto.—Mr. Grattan's opinion thereon.—His Letter to Mr. M'Can.—Questions in 1809.—Sale of Writership and Seat in Parliament by Lord Castlereagh.—Mr. Grattan's conduct thereon.—History of that shameful transaction.—Public immorality and corruption.—Conduct of the Duke of York.—Investigation by the House of Commons.—Mrs. Clarke.—Mr. Grattan votes against the Duke, who is removed from the command of the Army.—Expedition to Walcheren.—Great loss experienced by the Army.—Subject of the Irish Union.—Mr. Grattan's Letters thereon.—Trade and Exports of Ireland.—Mr. Grattan's Letters to Messrs. M'Can and Berwick . Page 367

CHAPTER XII.

Irish tithes.—Mr. Grattan brings on the Catholic question in 1810.—Domestic nomination of Catholic bishops disregarded by ministers.—Mr. Grattan complains of his absence from Ireland.—Injury from absenteeism.—His life in London.—Visits to Richmond to Mr. Sharp.—Samuel Rogers.—Cumberland.—Interesting conversation.—Anecdote of Kean and Miss O'Neill.—Leadership of the opposition offered to Tierney, accepted by Ponsonby.—Distress of Ireland.—

Resolutions against the Union.—Public meeting and petitions against it.—Mr. Grattan's answer and opinion thereon.—Banks's charge that Ireland was a burthen to England.—Foster's spirited reply.—Illness of George III.—Conduct of Mr. Perceval.—Mr. Grattan's letter.—Opposes the restrictions on the Regency.—Mr. Ponsonby's able speech.—Defeat of ministers on the household.—Mr. Grattan's speech.—Prince accepts the office.—Lord Grenville, auditor of the exchequer, refuses to issue the public money.—Unconstitutional power assumed by the Commons.—Conduct of Sheridan.—Court intrigues.—Arrangement of the new ministry.—Lord Grenville and Lord Grey dissatisfied.—The No-Popery administration continued.—Mr. Grattan disclaims a spurious reply to Flood.—Letters to M'Can.—Letter on the Irish finances.—Sir John Newport's motion.—Mr. Grattan's letter on reform.—On the interchange of militia.—Letters to James Grattan, in Sicily, on public affairs . . Page 409

CHAPTER XIII.

Commencement of the Prince Regent's Government in 1811.—Proceedings of the Catholics.—Mr. Pole's circular letter.—Mr. Grattan's remarks.—Presents the Catholic petition.—Motion thereon, and reply to Mr. Perceval.—Conduct of the No-Popery Government.—Prosecution of the Catholics.—Arrest of Lord Fingall.—Unconstitutional conduct of the Chief Justice.—Convention Act.—Trial of the delegates.—Acquittal of Dr. Sheridan.—Trial of Mr. Kirwan.—Conduct of Sir Charles Saxton, Under Secretary.—Tampers with the jury lists.—Speech of Mr. Peter Burrowes.—Mr. Kirwan found guilty.—Conduct of the prince.—His letter to the Duke of Richmond as to Lord Leitrim.—Lord Hutchinson's spirited conduct.—Lord Grenville's and Mr. Horner's Letters.—Lord Morpeth's motion as to Ireland.—Mr. Grattan's speech.—America, orders in Council.—Mr. Grattan on Mr. Perceval's policy.—Petition from the Protestants of Ireland in favour of the Catholics.—Mr. Grattan moves Catholic petition, 23rd April, 1812.—Speech.—Mr. Perceval assassinated.—Mr. Grattan's letters.—Incapacity of Ministers to conduct the Government.—Record thereof.—Attempts to form an administration.—Mr. Wortley's motion.—Hostility of the Prince.—Old ministry retained.—Remarks on negotiations.—On Lords Grey, Grenville, and Moira . Page 445

CHAPTER XIV.

Conduct of the Catholics in 1812.—*Witchery Resolutions*.—Mr. Hay (Secretary).—Letter thereon.—Motion in Parliament by Mr. Canning and Lord Wellesley.—Mr. Grattan's friends meet at Tinnehinch, and prepare the bill for Catholic Relief.—His letters.—Introduces the bill in the new Parliament.—His resolutions.—Meeting of the English members at Mr. Ponsonby's.—Proceedings on the bill.—Rejected by Four!—Conduct of the Speaker (Abbot).—Conduct of the Prince.—Mr. Grattan's opinion and letter.—Lord Castlereagh.—Election for Down.—Lady Downshire's letter.—Conduct of the Catholics.—Application to Lord Donoughmore by Mr. Grattan.—Mr. Wilberforce's letter.—Mr. Grattan declines to move on the

Catholic petition in 1814.—Catholic Board suppressed by proclamation.—Conduct of Mr. Saurin.—Letter of Peter Burrowes as to Mr. Hay.—Disagreement in opinion between the Catholics and Mr. Grattan.—Their petition entrusted to Sir Henry Parnell.—Roscommon address to Mr. Grattan.—His reply.—Mrs. Grattan goes to France.—Defeat of Buonaparte.—Princess of Wales.—Corn Laws. Page 483

CHAPTER XV.

Buonaparte's return from Elba.—Question of War.—Mr. Grattan supports it.—His speech, and remarks on Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke.—Lord Grey opposes it.—Remarks on the conduct of the Opposition; on Lord Castlereagh and the Tory Party.—Catholic Question brought on by Sir Henry Parnell.—Feeling on the subject.—Mr. Grattan speaks.—Distress in Ireland.—Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald's letter.—Sir J. Newport's motion as to Ireland.—Effects of the Union.—National Bankruptcy.—Consolidation of the Exchequers.—Sir John Newport's letter to Mr. Grattan.—Catholic Question.—Mr. Bellew.—Sir H. Parnell's letter.—Catholic Committee apply to Mr. Grattan to support their claims (1817).—Sir James Mackintosh's remarks on debate (note).—Death of Ponsonby and Curran.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Lady Charleville.—Window Tax.—Discontent of Citizens of Dublin.—Mr. Grattan elected for Dublin, fifth time.—Attacked when chaired.—His reply to addresses then.—Proposes Catholic Question, 1819.—Letter to Judge Day.—Lord Holland's letter.—Diary of his illness and death. . . . . Page 515

APPENDIX.

1. Letters of Mr. Grattan to Edmund and Richard Burke in 1793-4 557
2. Protests of the Irish House of Lords against the Union . 564
3. Protest and Address of the Irish House of Commons against the Union 574
4. Names of some who petitioned for and against the Union . 588
5. Lord Grenville's Letter to Lord Fingall, 1810 . . 592
6. Prince Regent's Letter, and Mr. Percival's Reply, on the Regency, 1811 597
7. Prince Regent's Letter to the Duke of York, and Lords Grey and Grenville's Reply 599
8. Parody of a celebrated Letter, by Thomas Moore . . 602
9. Address of the Catholic Board to Mr. Grattan, and Reply, 1812 605
10. List of Divisions in Parliament on the Catholic Question . 608

INDEX

to

THE LETTERS IN VOLUME V.

	Page
Lord Cornwallis to Lord Mornington, March 2, 1800	128
Edward May to Lord Donegal, October 22, 1800	134
Edward Cook to Lord Castlereagh, March 3, 1801	217
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick, July 25, 1803	223
Same .. to Mr. Wickham, August, 1803	231
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, do	231
Same .. to Same do	232
Lord Fitzwilliam to Mr. Grattan, September 23, 1803	234
Same .. to Mr. Plowden, do.	234
Mr. Plowden to Mr. Grattan, October 8, 1803	235
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Fox, December 4, 1803	239
Same .. to Same, December 9, 1803	240
Same .. to Same, December 12, 1803	241
Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan, March 17, 1804	243
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick, October 24, 1804	245
Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan, March 13, 1805	254
Same .. to Same, March 16, 1805	255
Same .. to Same, March 23, 1805	256
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick, April 13, 1805	256
Lord Fitzwilliam to Mr. Grattan, April 27, 1805	257
Dr. O'Leary to Mr. Grattan, May 25, 1805	263
Lord Tyrawly to Mr. Grattan, May 26, 1805	264
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick, June 10, 1805	265
Same .. to Mr. Hardy, June 14, 1805	266
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, June 19, 1805	267
Same .. to James Grattan, June 22, 1805	269
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, July 15, 1805	271
Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan, July 16, 1805	272

Page

Mr. Grattan to James Grattan, July 14, 1805 . . . 273
Same .. to Same, July 28, 1805 . . . 273
Same .. to Same, July 29, 1805 . . . 275
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, September 8, 1805 . . 277
Same .. to Mr. James Grattan, October 10, 1805 . 277
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, November 23, 1805 . 278
Same .. to Same, December 19, 1805 . . 278
Same .. to Mr. Plowden, December 28, 1805 . 279
Same .. to James Grattan, February 16, 1806 . 292
Mr. Fox to Mr. Ryan, February 18, 1806 . . 295
The Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan, February 19, 1806 . 296
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Hardy, February 20, 1806 . . 297
Same .. to Henry Grattan, February 20, 1806 . 300
Same .. to Same, February 22, 1806 . . 302
The Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan, March 14, 1806 . 303
Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick, Patrick's Day, 1806 . 305
Same to Mr. M'Can, March 31, 1806 . . . 306
Same .. to Same, April 1, 1806 . . . 307
Same .. to James Grattan, April 7, 1806 . . 307
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, April 15, 1806 . . 308
Same .. to Archibald Hamilton Rowan, April 22, 1806 . 311
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, May 8, 1806 . . . 315
Same .. to Same, June 5, 1806 . . . 315
Same .. to Same, June 17, 1806 . . . 316
Same .. to Same, June 30, 1806 . . . 316
Same .. to Same, July 24, 1806 . . . 317
The Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan, September 30, 1806 . 318
Sir John Newport to Mr. Grattan, October 16, 1806 . 320
Mr. Grattan to the Secretary of the Board of Education, March 25, 1811 321
Mr. John Keogh to Mr. Grattan, November 8, 1806 . 326
The Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan, November 9, 1806 . 326
Mrs. Grattan to Mr. Hartley, Esq., December 7, 1806 . 327
Lord Fitzwilliam to Mr. Grattan, December 28, 1806 . 328
Mr. Hardy to Mr. Grattan, January 5, 1807 . . 330
The Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan, January 9, 1807 . 331
Mr. Grattan to Mr. M'Can, February 21, 1807 . . 336
The Lord Chancellor to Mr. Grattan, March 7, 1807 . 337
Same .. to Same, March 7, 1807 . . . 338
Mr. Elliot to Mr. Grattan, March 10, 1807 . . 340
Same .. to Same, March 14, 1807 . . . 340
Mr. Grattan to the Duke of Bedford, March 16, 1807 . 344
Same .. to Lord Fingall, March 21, 1807 . . 346
Same .. to Same, March 21, 1807 . . . 346
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, March 28, 1807 . . 349
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, April 18, 1807 . . 349
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, July 26, 1807 . . 362
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, August 10, 1807 . . 362
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, August 18, 1807 . . 363
Same .. to Same, August 26, 1807 . . . 363
Same .. to Mr. Sterne Hart, August 28, 1807 . 364
Same .. to Henry Grattan, August 29, 1807 . . 365
Same .. to Matthew O'Conor, Esq., February 1, 1808 . 368

Page
Mr. Grattan to Mr. M'Can, February 11, 1808 . . . 368
Same .. to Same, May 6, 1808 370
Same .. to Same, May 13, 1808 380
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, June 20, 1808 . . . 382
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, April 31, 1809 . . . 397
Same .. to Mr. Henry Grattan, December 3, 1809 . . 400
Same .. to Same, December 6, 1809 400
Same .. to Mr. Hardy, February 15, 1810 . . . 402
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, February 19, 1810 . . . 403
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, April 9, 1810 . . . 403
Lord Dungannon to Mr. Grattan, September 8, 1810 . . 418
Mr. Grattan to Henry Grattan, December 4, 1810 . . 423
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, January 5, 1811 . . . 427
Same .. to Same, March 5, 1811 435
Same .. to Same, March 7, 1811 436
Same .. to Same, April 3, 1811 439
Same .. to Mr. Henry Grattan, 1811 439
Same .. to Mr. Edward Hay, June 5, 1811 . . . 441
Same .. to Mr. James Grattan, June, 1811 . . . 442
Same .. to Same, July, 1811 443
Lord Grenville to Mr. Grattan 458
Mr. Horner to Mr. Allen, September 14, 1811 . . . 458
Mr. Grattan to Mr. M'Can, March 3, 1812 . . . 472
Same .. to Mr. Berwick, April 21, 1812 . . . 472
Same .. to Mr. M'Can, May 15, 1812 . . . 474
Same .. to Same, June 18, 1812 429
Same .. to Same, February 12, 1313 490
Same .. to Same, May 25, 1813 496
Lady Downshire to Mr. Grattan, Nov. 2, 1812 . . . 498
Mr. Wilberforce to Mr. Grattan, April 30, 1814 . . . 500
Peter Burrows to Mr. Grattan, April 13, 1814 . . . 502
Mr. Grattan to H. Grattan, March 8, 1815 . . . 514
Mr. Vesy Fitzgerald to Mr. Grattan, 1816 . . . 523
John Newport to Mr. Grattan, October 25, 1817 . . . 528
Mr. Bellew to Mr. Grattan, February 1, 1817 . . . 531
Sir H. Parnell to Mr. Grattan, February 14, 1817 . . 532
Mr. Grattan to the Countess of Charleville, July 17, 1817 . 534
Same .. to Mr. Day, November 19, 1819 . . . 541
Lord Holland to Miss Fox, June 20, 1820 . . . 554

LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE

OF

HENRY GRATTAN.

CHAPTER I.

Ministers of George III. and Queen Elizabeth compared.—Policy of England towards Ireland.—Influence of the Crown in the Irish Parliament.—The superior advantages possessed by Ireland.—Conduct of the Irish Parliament.—Probability of a Union.—The proceedings of the Irish Government justified the course pursued by Mr. Grattan.—Inevitable consequence of their proceedings.—Sketch of the events that led to the Union.—Natural consequences.—Means adopted by Government.—Secret Service Money.—Sir John Parnell and James Fitzgerald dismissed from their offices for opposing the Union.—Letter of Mr. Fitzgerald to the Bar.—Their conduct.—Meeting and Resolutions as to the Union.—Meeting of Parliament, 22nd January, 1799.—Mr. Ponsonby's amendment against Union lost only by one!—Mr. Plunket's speech.—Sir Lawrence Parson's amendment against the Union carried on the 24th by five majority.—Union Paragraph rejected.—Great joy of the Irish People.—Addresses to the Members.—Mr. Saurin's reply.—The Regency Bill proposed by Mr. Fitzgerald.—Mr. Foster's (Speaker) speech against Union.

In one of Essex's letters to Queen Elizabeth, he writes,—"If your Majesty will have a strong party in the Irish nobility, and make use of them, you must hide from them all purposes of establishing English government, till the strength of the Irish be so broken that they shall see no safety but in your Majesty's protection."* Such was the spirit of the time of Elizabeth; such it was in the time of George the Third: his minister practised what her deputy recommended:† for

* Birch's Memoirs of Elizabeth, 2d vol. p. 416, 15th June, 1598.

† See Pacata Hibernia, for her orders to the Deputy in Munster, to torture the Irish.

years he had artfully concealed his real design; but when the strength of the Irish was broken,—their Volunteers disbanded—their people divided, and their nobles corrupted, then the plot transpired. Lord Clare, who had opposed the idea in 1785, only disclosed it when success was certain, and when the conspiracy of the minister against the Constitution was likely to be more successful than the conspiracy of the people against the Government. That Government had laboured for years to degrade the Legislature, and surrender it to Great Britain; and in one of his speeches, Lord Clare not only admits, but almost boasts that he had been for eight years engaged in this horrid plot. The minister had more powerful means at his disposal than the people; he had an abundant treasury,* an army of occupation, military government, and martial law: he had a House of Lords subservient to his will, and a House of Commons packed with his dependents; a distracted and dispirited people, and a broken-down insurrection: he had brought Ireland on her knees, and was about to place England on her back. To the latter, success was a great object, for by it she could dispense with the inconvenience of a second parliament, and disentangle herself from a constitution wrested from her in the moments of weakness,—which Ireland had strove to render independent, and which England had sought to prostrate from the outset in 1782. Another object of prominent importance to her was the trade and commerce of that kingdom, which she knew she could direct and divert

* See Burke's Posthumous Letters.—In 1781, the Treasury was so reduced that the Irish Government were obliged to borrow money, for the service of the State, from a private individual, and 20,000*l.* was advanced by Messrs. Latouche,—they then applied to a wealthy Roman Catholic of the county of Cork, Mr. Goold, who advanced 5000*l.*, thus were the Roman Catholics generous in the extreme, supporting a party that kept them excluded from honour, office, and power.

as she pleased, if in possession of her Legislature. This object she had kept for centuries continually in view. Her statute-book showed this unrelenting disposition. She had destroyed the export trade of Ireland in the time of Charles II.* by the navigation act, and destroyed its woollen trade in the time of William. In 1778 she yielded a stinted measure of concession, which she sought to more than neutralise by the propositions of 1785, attempting to cheat the manufacturers and traders of Ireland, passing the resolutions, suggested by the jealousy of her merchants, which declared that England's commercial decisions should be registered by Ireland. Failing in her base designs, she threatened a union. These ominous words she was now about to verify, forgetful that no country deserved to be treated by England better than Ireland, and that no country had been treated worse.

Ireland had made many and great sacrifices to British interest and British supremacy,—to her love of gain, and her love of power. She had made herself, to a great extent, an auxiliary to British empire and British commerce. She had not launched into that military and commercial independence for which her situation, her ambition, and her resources qualified her: she had refrained in 1782, (when she was irresistible)—but because she would not yield all; because she required some practical freedom, some chance of prosperity, England determined to make her surrender even the forms of nationality. The surrender which was now sought for was to be extorted by force and bribery. The Volunteer proceedings of 1782 were now to be avenged;

* Following out a law of Cromwell's; for the English Republic and the English Dictator were as unjustly avaricious as the legitimate monarch, but they were not so treacherous or ungrateful; they did not sacrifice their adherents for a truce.

and the words of Lord Camden were about to be realised, which, prophet-like, he had spoken when passing the Volunteer brigades which were reviewed in the north of Ireland in 1782: he foretold that "*England would never forgive her;*" and exclaimed, "*England considers this an insult, and will, when she can, make you feel that she does so.*"* In addition to the feelings of wounded pride were added those of interest. England was a nation of manufacturers; Arkwright,† Bolton,‡ and Watt had raised her skill and industry to an exalted and unexampled height, and had enabled her to make rapid strides in manufactures, trade, and commerce. She grew jealous of every rival; she thought that in Ireland she beheld one that would hereafter prove a dangerous and successful competitor.§ Accordingly, she craftily planned a return to her old system, and not only determined to discourage, but to destroy. She saw in Ireland the germ of future greatness. She feared her power,—she disliked her people,—she hated their religion. Situated as Ireland was, between the new and the old world; possessed of superior advantages, fertile soil, genial climate, splendid harbours, abundant water-power for manufactures, and inhabited by a hardy, industrious, and

* See Dr. Haliday's Letter, *ante*, vol. iv. p. 312.

† Richard Arkwright invented the machinery for spinning cotton; he was originally a barber, and travelled through England buying hair; becoming acquainted with a clockmaker, he mentioned to him some mechanical project, which the clockmaker urged him to apply to the spinning of cotton; he did so, and by the aid of some friends obtained money to take out a patent, which in 1769 he effected. He set up in Derbyshire, where he erected extensive works and accumulated a very large fortune, was created a knight, became high-sheriff of the county of Derby, and died there in 1793. It was the spinning-jenny that made Sir Robert Peel's fortune.

‡ Introduced the use of the steam engine in manufactories; see *ante*, Mr. Grattan's letter to Mr. Broome, vol. iii. p. 338, where he speaks of Mr. Bolton as a most useful philosophical man.

§ See the Report of the Committee on Trade and Plantations with the evidence of the English manufacturers in 1785.

abstemious race of men, without inclination to vice, or temptation to luxury; knowing little of the amassment of wealth, the allurements of pleasure, or the seductive dangers that follow from a more advanced state of civilization. Such a country was destined by nature to become great. England perceived it, and determined to crush it in its infancy.

To the powerful influence, and hungry resolve of England at the hour of the Union, Ireland had little to oppose. A House of Lords nominated by the Crown, and submissive to the Government; a House of Commons selected by the aristocracy, and pensioned by the Court; a gentry divided among themselves, and distinct from the people, opposed to their liberties, and hostile to their religion; the people purposely kept ignorant, and divided by civil and religious disabilities; the majority disqualified and excluded from the Parliament, and from honours and office in the state, —What a fearful picture!—what a discouraging prospect for the freedom of a nation! What a disgrace to the Protestant who sanctioned, to the Catholic who endured; and above all, to Great Britain who had imposed a tyranny so horrid, and formed a plan so revolting, and used the results for so wicked a consummation!

The plan which preceded the meditated attempt, and by which it was effected, was chiefly the introduction of a system of bribery and corruption unprecedented, except in the British Parliament itself; but the corruptors of the English senate were natives, — those of Ireland were aliens. In the few preceding years the growth of the influence of the Crown in Ireland had been enormous; fifteen new parliamentary places, and three new judges, created in 1789; five treasury places in '93; thirty-two militia colonels, and

thirty-two county judges—all but the first and last capable of sitting in Parliament: thus, the House of Commons was fast growing into a House of Lords, as the House of Lords had grown into a court; and nothing could save the country from the parliament but a reform, and this was a measure that, when proposed, had met with uniform opposition and defeat. It is a mistake to say the democratic power was dangerous in Ireland. The Irish are not a democratic people; their tendencies are the other way; but some infusion of democracy was essential to preserve the constitution and the nation,—for the House of Commons, directly or indirectly, was become the grand pensioner of the Court. The purchase of seats, the sale of peerages,* the corruption of the city of Dublin,† the Convention Bill, Gunpowder Bill, suspension of habeas corpus, transportation without trial, without inquiry—indemnification for measures of violence, and even for acts of torture—acts unreproved by the minister in England,—carried and defended by the minister in Ireland,—had sunk the character of the House of Commons, and reduced it below the court level. The intermeddling of the British minister; the insidious and mischievous attempts of his Viceroys to divide Protestant from Catholic, followed by further attempts to divide Catholic from Catholic, and urging on the incoherency of Parliament; rejecting the Presbyterian and Catholic petitions at one moment‡—receiving them in the next;§ passing then the system of corruption; voting that of coercion; permitting that of torture, and suffering the commander-in-chief ‖ to imprison and transport at pleasure all whom he pleased; the peculiar miserableness of the House of Lords,

* Vol. iii. p. 453. † Vol. iv. App. No. 1. ‡ 1792.
§ 1793. ‖ Lord Coarhampton.

almost in subjection under the violent and termagant thraldom of the Chancellor,—all these causes had brought both Houses of Parliament to the lowest level (the object that the British minister always had in view). The House of Commons was not a popular assembly: its vices stimulated, its virtues crossed, and punished by Great Britain, it had remained satisfied with having acquired independency, and had generally declined the exercise of it, as well as of most other efficient popular functions; it lost the merit of the good laws which it had passed — the Place Bill, the Pension Bill, the Responsibility Bill,—having first rejected them, and at last passed them, when the clamour of the people, and the progress of the French, had terrified the ministry, who at last allowed the Parliament to act.

Those inherent vices were great; it only partially represented a sect; two-thirds were returned by individuals. It excluded a sect which comprehended three-fourths of the people; and yet it opposed the ambition of England. It was a body half-bought by the Court—distinct from the Irish, and opposed to the English; in fact, the destruction of such a Parliament was a matter of demonstration. No government or parliament such as this, without credit or authority, can last, except by power; but the power that supported the Irish Parliament in this case was the power of England, and the power of England must, sooner or later, prefer the Parliament of England: it followed that union, or reform, had become inevitable.

It is not then to be wondered that the Irish Parliament acted ill; on the contrary, it is a matter of surprise that it acted so well, and that with such materials it effected so much at

first, and made such a resistance in the end. The frequent appeals to the people and the volunteers, led on by discreet and wise leaders, effected the business in 1782; and had they been armed, they would not afterwards have lost their liberty in 1800. Lafayette's plan to arm the French nation was a fine one: while the national guards exist, the people can never be enslaved.

The secret that decided the fate of Irish power, decided also the fate of the Irish Parliament. Parliament owed its rescue in 1782 to the strength of the people; and its abolition in 1800 to their overthrow. There were peculiar circumstances attending and impelling this catastrophe; there are always in such cases* such circumstances, but these do not vary the principle. The Union, as regarded the Irish nation, was an act of power and corruption; *the Irish Parliament did not consent to its own abolition.* No such thing; it refused its consent, and then, by force, was compelled to yield. True, it sold the right; but it was when it was driven to the alternative of leaguing with an insurrection defeated by itself, and embarking in a war, or of yielding to the minister whatever he demanded; it was a sale, and *a forced sale.* If the House had been left free, it had preferred the Parliament to the bribe; but knowing that Government would carry the measure, it received money for doing what it thought could not be prevented. The apology for the Parliament is, that it did not represent the people; the excuse for the people is, they were unarmed, and freshly defeated; but for the

* And it is not necessary for the truth of this proposition to inquire into the guilt or innocence of the people. Posterity may acquit them: in my humble opinion they were fatally wrong, they afford a great lesson to all nations never to trust such tyrannical, sanguinary, and unconstitutional ministers as Lord Clare or Mr. Pitt; get rid of them sooner or later, but at all events, and in any way, get rid of them.

minister of Great Britain—and for that country —there is none.

The Union was a complete admission of the correctness of Mr. Grattan's conduct and views, and of the course he undeviatingly pursued with regard to Ireland. Those who argued and wrote in support of the Union proved all the positions he had laid down as to the mode necessary to be adopted for governing the country; they contended that Parliament was just what he said it was, and that it required reform; they even stated that it was much worse: such was the tenor of Mr. Secretary Cooke's pamphlet,—such Lord Clare's speech; it was tantamount to saying that when Mr. Grattan inveighed against the corruption of Parliament he was right; that Parliament was an original evil—and an allied legislature a necessary failure: they went further, and in other respects they admitted that he was also right. For, as to tithe, they wrote and admitted that it was a great practical evil: thus the Government gave up all that they had contended for in the years 1787, '88, and '89; they admitted that in these years Mr. Grattan was right; still more, that he was right as to the condition of the poor, and that he should have gone farther and have inveighed against the tyranny of the landlords: such was the purport of Mr. Douglas's (Lord Glenbervie's) speech in the English Parliament. On the Catholic question, too, they admitted that Mr. Grattan was right; that the king's oath did not stand in the way; that the Catholics might safely become part of the state and legislature; that they were not enemies to a Protestant king,—and that their emancipation was not irreconcilable to the preservation of the kingdom, and that without it the United Empire could not be safe: in fine, they admitted that he was right as to the reform

of Parliament. Such were the arguments resorted to by the minister at the Union. The ministers allowed it then, though they had denied it before: it is true that at the Union they aggravated all this, but they acknowledged it all. Herein only they differed from him that the Government advanced these charges with tenfold aggravation, and inferred, not as Mr. Grattan did, the necessity of the reform of the Constitution, but the extermination of the Constitution itself, and the introduction of a new one.

All these unworthy artifices—the political manœuvres, the violence, corruption, bigotry, intolerance of the age—all these events did not arise from the religion of the country, from the character or constitution of the people, from the Ministry, from the Opposition, from the Catholic Convention, nor from the United Irish Confederacy, from Mr. Grattan or Mr. Ponsonby, or Mr. Keogh or Mr. Tone. A strong island enslaves a weak one; she afterwards involves herself in a calamitous war;* she affords to the weak one an opportunity of recovering its liberty, and she stipulates with that island to yield part of her own domination, and to keep the remainder; she gets back into peace, and then exercises the power she keeps to recover the power which she had lost. For this purpose she infuses corruption, excites suspicion, discontent, and religious hatred; she divides and disarms, but gets involved in another calamitous war,† and gives an opportunity to the oppressed and disappointed country to revolt. She obtains from that country a great army to repel the enemy, she uses that army to quell the people, and then uses her success to revoke her former concessions. This was precisely the case of Ireland. England took away her liberties,

* American war, 1779. † French war, 1792.

Ireland took advantage of the American war to regain them; England capitulated, she restored the Legislature and retained the Government; and the power of that Government was employed to corrupt and make dependent that Legislature; Ireland went back into discontent, and clamour on the part of the people produced punishment and acts of despotism on the part of the Government. A calamitous war arises; the Government inclines to capitulate; the alteration of measures and men form, of necessity, the base of that capitulation; a faithful slave is dismissed;* he appeals to a corrupt court, where he finds that he has more friends than the people; he fills every place with lamentation. In this court he finds an old fellow-slave, and this fellow-slave finds a Bishop,† and this Bishop is advised to resort to the King, and the King is taught to believe that, by his oath, he cannot assent to a plan of conciliation; accordingly, the plan is withdrawn, the conciliator disgraced,‡ and the slave sent back in triumph. Then the people become turbulent, an officer is sent to them to punish their turbulence,§ and he transports them without trial. The people appeal to France. The Government has a great army; lets that army loose on the people; they rebel, and are vanquished (the time of revolt being chosen by the Government); the country is enslaved, and all her late acquisitions taken from her. All these events, as already stated, flowed from natural, not from artificial causes; but these may have been aided, or might have been retarded, by the character of the Prime Minister of England,‖ his love of power, the genius of his reign, the violence of the

* Beresford. † Bishops of Dublin and London.
‡ Lord Fitzwilliam, lord lieutenant. § Lord Coarhampton.
‖ Mr. Pitt.

Irish Cabinet, and, above all, the French Revolution. They could only have been prevented by reform or separation.

Some of these artificial causes grew out of the natural ones. For instance, the men of the Irish court were made by the events. A rich and a powerful country desires dominion, and her ambition is the fortune of adventurers. The weak country furnishes men who have an interest in selling themselves and their talents, their violence, and their craft (the attributes of their servility and means of their fortune). This suffices to answer those writers who sought for the causes of Irish calamity in the nature of her people and in their religion; and when we find one or more natural causes we have found a clue to the rest, and here are two of them—the love of power and the love of independency; from the former no society was ever entirely free, and from the latter none whatsoever. These two passions induced the English to struggle for a dominion over the Irish Legislature, and agitated the people of Ireland to oppose her; and these two passions set in action, talents, venality, licentiousness, cruelty, and rebellion; the torture, free quarter, assassination, perfidy, and Union.

The result and the particulars of these proceedings are the subject of the following pages.

In order to carry such a measure as the Union, Government found it necessary to resort to all the means that stratagem, violence, intimidation, and corruption could supply. The military were in every quarter—less sanguinary, but intemperate. Threatening and overbearing proclamations for "putting down the Rebellion" were again issued and circulated, as if it still raged throughout the country, the Government party declaring that it was only lulled but not extinguished, and that it

certainly would again burst forth in all its horrors; arrests and imprisonments still took place, the system of terror was again revived, and no one was allowed to leave the kingdom without a licence or a passport from the Government.

The wicked policy of the Government may be judged of from the following circumstance:—In the preceding volume it has been mentioned that Hughes, the Government informer, had gone to Tinnehinch to entrap Mr. Grattan, that his evidence before the Secret Committee was totally false, and that he was guilty of gross perjury. By certain disclosures made within these few years, it appears that this man, subsequent to the discovery of his perjury, was still kept in the pay of Government, still received secret-service money, and was actually lodged and fed in Dublin Castle, and lived beneath the same roof with the representative of the Sovereign!! That such instruments as informers should have been employed by Ministers is credible, though disgraceful and detestable, but that, after discovering their perfidy, their falsehood, and their glaring perjury, especially in such a case as Mr. Grattan's, any minister or any lord lieutenant should uphold and protect them, and place them even in the palace of the Viceroy, would almost exceed belief; none would have thought that the foul deeds of the Inquisition, and the dreadful doings of the Roman Emperors, would find imitators and rivals in the Christian governors of Ireland.

The documents establishing these facts will be found in Dr. Madden's History of the United Irishmen, lately published. The author of these memoirs has ascertained, as far as lay in his power, that the documents are genuine, and that they came from the Castle of Dublin. In one of

them the accounts and names, and the sums paid to each person, are set forth; all are corrected and signed by the then under-secretary, *Edward Cooke*, and the payment *for secret-service money* is fully detailed: 53,547*l.*, appears charged in one account.

Judas got thirty pieces of silver for betraying the Redeemer, yet it belonged to the Jews; but Ireland was forced to pay the wages of her betrayers, and the price was national life.

The plan of Union was propounded in the latter end of 1798. The Government were determined that nothing should stop them in their efforts to accomplish their object, and they dismissed in the most summary manner Sir John Parnell from the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. James Fitzgerald from the legal situation of Prime Serjeant, in consequence of these individuals having differed from them on the subject of the Union. Their places were filled up by Mr. Isaac Corry and Mr. St. George Daly, both of whom sunk their reputation and ability in the abyss where they precipitated their country; the former had an excuse, as he was an adventurer without means, though not without talents; but the latter had a name to uphold, and the brother of Denis Daly ought not to have shamed so illustrious a relation. The Bar, however, determined to support the Prime Serjeant, and adopted a resolution thanking him for his noble conduct in preferring the good of his country to rank and emolument, and allowing him, as when in office, the same precedence in all cases in the courts. This roused the anger of the Lord Chancellor, he excited the Judges, and hence arose a serious difference* between the Bench and the

* The following incident occurred in the Court of Chancery. It was motion day, and according to usage the senior barrister present is called on by the bench to make his motions, after which the next in precedence is called, until the whole of the bar have been called on, down to the

Bar, which continued until the following letter was addressed to one of his brethren by Mr. Fitzgerald, in order to reconcile the disputants:—

January, 1795.

MY DEAR SIR,—Finding that the kindness of the Bar, conferring on me the most honourable distinction, has unexpectedly occasioned a controversy which might be injurious to the public business, I most earnestly request that they will permit me to act in the rank which I at present hold—as I shall otherwise feel myself called upon to quit a profession to which the kindness of my brethren has attached me more than ever.—I have the honour to be, my dear Sir, your very sincere and faithful servant,

JAMES FITZGERALD.

Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of Lord Clare to intimidate and corrupt the Bar; the creation of places and appointment of officers; his denunciation of Mr. Fletcher, his expulsion of Mr. Curran, and the overbearing, browbeating manner which he introduced into his court, yet on this occasion the Bar upheld their independence. In the month of December, 1798, in a meeting at the Exhibition-room in William-street, they had assembled and agreed to a resolution—"That the measure of the Legislative Union

youngest barrister. The Attorney and Solicitor Generals having made their motions, the Chancellor called on Mr. Smith, the father of the bar, who bowed and said Mr. Saurin had precedence of him; he then called on Mr. Saurin, who bowed and said Mr. Ponsonby had precedence of him; Mr. Ponsonby in like manner said Mr. Curran had precedence; and Mr. Curran said he could not think of moving anything before Mr. Fitzgerald, who certainly had precedence of him; the Chancellor then called on Mr. Fitzgerald, who bowed and said he had no motion to make; and this caused the Chancellor to speak out—"I see, gentlemen, you have not then relinquished the business; it would be better at once for his Majesty's council, if they do not choose to conform to the regulations of the court, to resign their silk-gowns, *than sit thus in a sort of rebellion against their sovereign.* I dismiss the causes in which these gentlemen are retained, with costs on both sides;" and thus saying, Lord Clare left the bench. The attorneys immediately determined they would not charge any costs.

between this kingdom and Great Britain is an innovation which it would be highly dangerous and improper to propose at the present juncture of the country." This resolution was proposed by Mr. William Saurin, afterwards Attorney-General, and was carried by 166 to 32. Those who distinguished themselves by supporting the interests of their country deserve to have their names transmitted to posterity.* Instigated by the hopes of gain and by their factious chiefs, the minority of the Bar protested against the proceedings of their brethren, and signed five declarations expressive of their opinion on the question; most of them were subsequently recompensed for their conduct, some were pro-

* Barristers who opposed the Union:—

Edward Mayne.	Eyre Burton Powel.	W. P. Ruxton.
Charles Bushe.	Beresford Burston.	M. J. O'Dwyer.
H. Joy.	John Barrington.	Samuel Rudleton.
Charles Hamilton.	J. W. Bell.	Joshua Spencer.
Redmond Barry.	William Saurin.	John Hamilton.
Richard Jebb.	W. C. Plunket.	George Barnes.
Peter Burrowes.	A. C. McCartney.	Thomas Goold.
John Lloyd.	J. Jameson.	Mr. Orr.
William Vavasour.	P. Doyne.	N. P. Leader.
William Sankey.	R. Lyster.	F. Dobbs.
T. O'Driscoll.	Gerald O. Farrel.	Mr. Lynch.

List of barristers favourable to the Union:—

St. Geo. Daly.*	J. Homan.†	Robert Torrens.*
J. Jameson.‖	W. Norcott.	James Geraghty.†
Wm. Smith.*	Thomas Vickers.†	F. W. Fortescue.
Thomas Monsell.	Thomas Grady.†	Richard F. Sharkey.†
C. K. Garnett.†	John Dwyer, jun.‡	J. D. Clarke.
John White.	John Beresford.‡	Thomas Morgell.†
Wm. Johnson.*	R. J. Leslie.†	W. Longfield.¶
Archibald Radford.	Thomas Scott.†	J. W. Stokes.†
Jas. McClelland.*	P. F. Henchy.‡	John Ball, jun.
William Turner.†	T. Keller.‖	Henry Cole.†
John Schoales.†	Henry Brook.†	William Roper.†

* So marked were appointed judges of the supreme court.
† So marked were appointed county judges.
‡ Commissioner of bankrupts.
§ Got an office in custom-house.
‖ Got an office in court of chancery.
¶ Commissioner to distribute the *million and a half Union compensation.*

moted to the Bench, others got places; baseness was the test of merit.

It happened most unfortunately for the country that Mr. Grattan was not in Parliament when the Union was proposed, having declined to stand at the general election in 1797; he had retired disgusted and dispirited; the calamities of his country preyed upon his mind, and had so strongly affected him as almost to endanger his life. After the trial at Maidstone, where he had given evidence in the case of Arthur O'Connor, he remained in England in a very precarious state of health, and quite unable to attend to public business, and in particular to any affairs connected with the transactions in Ireland. Notwithstanding his absence, the Opposition in the House of Commons was well conducted; the leaders possessed talent and knowledge, but had not that weight with the people that the exigency of the case required, and were not generally known beyond the precincts of the House, or the immediate sphere of their Parliamentary action. Under these circumstances Parliament opened on the 22d of January, 1799, and the debate on the Union commenced, in consequence of the reference to it in the King's Speech. It continued for twenty-one hours, having begun at four and lasted till one o'clock on the ensuing day. It was conducted with great ability, great spirit, and great ardour. Mr. George Ponsonby made a famous speech against the measure. That of Lord Castlereagh was bold and impudent. The address containing the paragraph that recommended the Union was as follows:—

The unremitting industry with which our enemies persevere in their avowed design of endeavouring to effect a separation of this kingdom from Great Britain must have engaged your particular attention; and his Majesty com-

mands me to express his anxious hope that this consideration, joined to the sentiment of mutual affection and common interest, may dispose the Parliaments in both kingdoms to provide the most effectual means of maintaining and improving a connexion essential to their common security, and of consolidating, as far as possible, into one firm and lasting fabric, the strength, the power, and the resources of the British Empire."

Mr. George Ponsonby then moved to insert the following words after the passage declaring the readiness of the House to consider the measures best tending to confirm the strength of the empire:—

Maintaining, however, the undoubted birthright of the people of Ireland to have a resident and independent Legislature, such as it was recognised by the British Legislature in 1782, and was finally settled at the adjustment of all differences between the two countries.

This amendment was seconded by Sir Laurence Parsons (afterwards Lord Rosse), and produced a most spirited debate. It was supported by Mr. Fitzgerald (late Prime Serjeant), Mr. Hardy, Mr. Plunket, D. Bowes Daly, Barrington (Judge of Admiralty), Ogle, Ball, A. Browne (Member for the University), F. Faulkner, Richard Dawson, G. and W. Ponsonby. It was opposed by Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Rd. Martin, H. D. Grady, Mr. Smith, St. George Daly, Osborne, Toler, and Mr. Fitzgerald (Knight of Kerry).

Mr. (afterwards Lord) Plunket said—

Sir,—I had been induced to think that we had at the head of the executive Government in this country a plain honest soldier, unaccustomed to and disdaining the intrigues of politics, and who, as an additional evidence of the directness and purity of his views, had chosen for his secretary a simple and modest youth (*puer ingenui vultus ingenuique pudoris*) whose inexperience was the voucher of his innocence; and yet I will be bold to say, that during the Viceroyalty of this unspotted veteran, and during the Administration of this unassuming stripling—

within these last six weeks—a system of black corruption has been carried on within the walls of the Castle, which would disgrace the annals of the worst period of the history of either country. Do you choose to take down my words? I need call no witnesses to your bar to prove them. I see two Right Honourable Gentlemen sitting within your walls, who had long and faithfully served the Crown, and who have been dismissed because they dared to express a sentiment in favour of the freedom of their country. I see another Honourable Gentleman, who has been forced to resign his place as Commissioner of the Revenue, because he refused to co-operate in this dirty job of a dirty Administration: do you dare to deny this? I say that at this moment the threat of dismissal from office is suspended over the heads of the Members who now sit around me, in order to influence their votes on the question of this night, involving everything that can be sacred or dear to man. Do you desire to take down my words? Utter the desire, and I will prove the truth of them at your bar. Sir, I would warn you against the consequences of carrying this measure by such means as this, but that I see the necessary defeat of it in the honest and universal indignation which the adoption of such means excites: I see the protection against the wickedness of the plan in the imbecility of its execution, and I congratulate my country that, when a design was formed against their liberties, the prosecution of it was entrusted into such hands as it is now placed. The example of the Prime Minister of England, imitable in its vices, may deceive the noble lord. The Minister of England has his faults; he abandoned in his latter years the principle of reform, by professing which he had attained the early confidence of the people of England, and in the whole of his political conduct he has shown himself haughty and intractable; but it must be admitted that he is endowed by nature with a towering and transcendent intellect, and that the vastness of his moral resources keeps pace with the magnificence and unboundedness of his projects. I thank God that it is much more easy for him to transfer his apostacy and his insolence, than his comprehension and sagacity; and I feel the safety of my country in the wretched feebleness of her enemy. I cannot fear that the constitution which has been formed by the wisdom of ages, and cemented by the blood of patriots and of heroes, is to be

smitten to its centre by such a green and limber twig as this. * * * * * Sir, I, in the most express terms, deny the competency of Parliament to do this act. I warn you, do not dare to lay your hands on the constitution. I tell you, that if, circumstanced as you are, you pass this act, it will be a mere nullity, and no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it. I make the assertion deliberately. I repeat it. I call on any man who hears me to take down my words. You have not been elected for this purpose. You are appointed to make laws, and not legislatures. You are appointed to exercise the functions of legislators, and not to transfer them. You are appointed to act under the constitution, and not to alter it; and, if you do so, your act is a dissolution of the Government; you resolve society into its usual elements, and no man in the land is bound to obey you. Sir, I state doctrines that are not merely founded on the immutable laws of truth and reason; I state not merely the opinions of the ablest and wisest men who have written on the science of government; but I state the practice of our constitution as settled at the era of the revolution; and I state the doctrine under which the House of Hanover derives its title to the throne. Has the King a right to transfer his crown? Is he competent to annex it to the crown of Spain, or any other country? No; but he may abdicate it, and every man who knows the constitution knows the consequence—the right reverts to the next in succession. If they all abdicate, it reverts to the people. The man who questions this doctrine, in the same breath must arraign the sovereign on the throne as a usurper. Are you competent to transfer your legislative rights to the French Council of Five Hundred? Are you competent to transfer them to the British Parliament? I answer no!—If you transfer, you abdicate; and the great original trust reverts to the people, from whom it issued. *Yourselves you may extinguish, but Parliament you cannot extinguish. It is enthroned in the hearts of the people—it is enshrined in the sanctuary of the constitution—it is as immortal as the island which protects it.* As well might the frantic suicide hope that the act which destroys his miserable body should extinguish his eternal soul! Again I therefore warn you. Do not dare to lay your hands on the constitution—it is above your powers. * * * I will be bold to say that licentious and impious France,

in all the unrestrained excesses to which anarchy and atheism have given birth to, has not committed a more insidious act against her enemy than is now attempted by the professed champion of the cause of civilised Europe against a friend and ally in the hour of her calamity and distress—at a moment when our country is filled with British troops, when the loyal men of Ireland are fatigued and exhausted by their efforts to subdue the rebellion, efforts in which they had succeeded before those troops arrived—whilst the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended—whilst trials by court-martial are carrying on in many parts of the kingdom—whilst the people are taught to think they have no right to meet or deliberate—and whilst the great body of them are so palsied by their fears, or worn down by their exertions, that even the vital question is scarcely able to rouse them from their lethargy—at a moment when we are distracted by domestic dissensions —dissensions artfully kept alive as the pretext of our present subjugation, and the instrument of our future thraldom.

The amendment was lost only by a majority of one. The numbers being 105 to 106. This was effected on the part of Government by base artifice, and was accompanied on the part of the individual concerned by gross dereliction both of public and of private duty. This person was Mr. Luke Fox, a rough, coarse, unprincipled lawyer; he came into Parliament professing to act with the national party, but when his vote would have been of essential service he betrayed them. On the division he was counted among the Opposition, when he declared that he had accepted the office of Escheatorship of Munster (a nominal place to enable members to vacate their seats). This excuse was allowed, although the writ was not moved for till several days after. If his vote had been counted the numbers would have been equal, and the casting-voice of the Speaker (Foster) would have decided the question against the Union; but the influence of Government

prevailed, and turned the balance against the country.

On the 24th the Report on the Address was brought up and Sir L. Parsons moved to omit the paragraph regarding the Union. This gave rise to another debate, which ended by the rejection of the paragraph, the numbers being—for expunging it, 109; against it, 104.

Mr. Ponsonby then submitted a motion to the House, which would have gone still further, and in an express manner declared its opinion against the Union: "Resolved, that this House will ever maintain the undoubted birthright of Irishmen by preserving an independent Parliament of Lords and Commons, resident within this kingdom, as settled and approved by his Majesty and the British Parliament in 1782."

Unfortunately this was not pressed as it ought to have been, nor supported as it deserved; and consequently Mr. Ponsonby withdrew it. Had this resolution been carried it might have led to the final overthrow of the measure, and several members were censured for their conduct on the occasion. It is, however, scarcely credible that the Minister would have suffered this resolution to pass, when his influence in the House was considered, and the desperate courses he adopted in order to carry his object; the greater the crime, the greater his audacity and recklessness.

The rejection of the Union paragraph diffused universal joy throughout the nation. Dublin was illuminated, the names of the popular members who had distinguished themselves on the occasion were celebrated at all the public dinners, and the health of the glorious majority * was

* Their names were printed in red, and circulated throughout the country, entitled, "The list of our glorious and virtuous defenders, that every man may engrave their names and their services on his heart, and hand them down to his children's children."

the toast on all occasions. Congratulatory addresses were presented to those who had opposed the Union; the most remarkable and complimentary were those to Lord Charlemont, Sir John Parnell, Mr. Foster, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Saurin, and Mr. Barrington.

From among these the answer of Mr. Saurin is here inserted. The opinion of this grave and steady character, who filled for so many years the office of Attorney-General in Ireland, and held such a legal reputation, is worthy of attention; but it is to be hoped that its forebodings may not be realised. Mr. Saurin's reply to the Guild of Merchants of Dublin:—

GENTLEMEN,—I could not have expected that the conduct of an individual (however well intended) could have attracted your attention, or deserved so flattering a mark of approbation as that with which you have been pleased to honour me; for which I beg to return you my warmest thanks.

If, gentlemen, the bar of Ireland, with which I acted and co-operated (and no greater merit can I presume to claim), has deserved applause for the zeal and patience with which they assisted in defending the laws and constitution of Ireland, when menaced by foreign and domestic enemies, that zeal was excited by the reverence and admiration with which they are accustomed to regard our laws and constitution.

If on a recent occasion, awfully portentous (as you are pleased to express it) to this kingdom, the great majority of that learned and constitutional body with which I am proud to have acted, and in whose sentiments I entirely and heartily concur, did, as far as it was in their power to do, resist the innovation, it was only, gentlemen, to preserve consistency with themselves, to adhere steadily to the principle on which they had so recently before taken up arms and submitted to become soldiers—the defence of the laws and Constitution of Ireland.

They saw that the measure so *improperly termed a Union between this kingdom and Great Britain was per-*

haps the only expedient that could be devised for separating the two countries.

They saw distinctly that it neither was, nor possibly could be, a remedy for any of the disorders which have of late unhappily afflicted this country—disorders which can only be remedied by wise government, salutary laws, or perhaps (though to be lamented) by coercion and force; remedies with which, however, a transfer of the Legislature from Ireland to Great Britain has no sort of connexion.

They saw it was a subversion and a sacrifice of the Constitution of Ireland, and a surrender of the most invaluable privilege of a nation, for doubtful, if not idle, speculations and visionary objects, when no necessity whatsoever existed for any constitutional changes.

And lastly, they saw that the present state of these countries, and of all Europe, rendered the present time peculiarly unfit for constitutional experiments and revolutionary measures.

"These sentiments account naturally for the conduct of that learned body; sentiments which the discussion of the question has fixed and confirmed.

I reflect, gentlemen, with great satisfaction, that we are not singular in our opinion—that these are also your sentiments, and I trust and believe those of the nation at large; that they have the sanction of those characters in the kingdom confessedly the highest in political wisdom, and most distinguished for knowledge of the interests of Ireland, and for attachment to those interests.

I cannot doubt that they must prevail. Gentlemen, it is almost superfluous to say, should the British Minister think fit to bring forward the measure at any future day, you need not entertain any doubt of the firmness and integrity of the great majority of the Bar of Ireland.—I have the honour to remain, your very obedient and faithfully attached,

WILLIAM SAURIN.

1799.

Though the question had been so far rejected by the omission of the paragraph, yet no opinion had been decisively given by the House of Commons against the principle of the Union; and the

House of Lords, by retaining the passage, had so far decided in its favour. The subject was accordingly renewed, and on various occasions brought before the House.

Mr. Dobbs, a patriotic but eccentric man, proposed five resolutions, for the purpose, as he expressed, of tranquillizing the country. They embraced the subjects of Emancipation and Reform. The first resolution proposed that all sinecure places should be abolished, and compensation made to the holders; that no person should sit in Parliament who held any office created since 1782; that Catholic Emancipation might be safely granted; that tithes should be abolished; that a provision should be made for the Catholic clergy and the Dissenting congregations. Most of these measures had been proposed by the Opposition in the last Parliament; they had been uniformly opposed by the Ministers, and on the present occasion were destined to meet no better fate. The motion was opposed by the Government; and even the usual form observed on such cases was dispensed with, and the question of adjournment was carried without even a discussion or one single word on the subject.

The haughtiness of Lord Clare was transferred to the Commons; and Lord Castlereagh added to the insolence of office all his cold and heartless indifference. Nothing of a conciliatory nature was suffered to escape the lips of the Government; and though the chief leader in the measure of Union (Lord Castlereagh) had pledged himself to support Reform, and though the plan of emancipating the Catholics was proposed to be part of the measure of Union, yet the Minister observed a total silence on both these subjects, and held out no hopes to the people; but the absolute, unconditional surrender of their liberties was exacted.

On the 15th February, Lord Corry brought forward a motion for a Committee to inquire into the state of the nation; and proposed an address to his Majesty, expressive of attachment to his person and government, and of the unshaken determination to preserve the full and final adjustment of Independence of 1782, as necessary for the safety of Ireland and security of the Empire. The debate lasted nearly fourteen hours. The motion was supported with great ability by Dr. Brown, of the College, Messrs. Ponsonby, Knox, Ogle, James Fitzgerald, Lord Cole, and Sir John Parnell. It was opposed by Messrs. Smith, L. Fox, M'Clelland, Osborne (all of whom were created Judges), Sir J. Cotter, and Sir John Blaquiere. It was lost by 103 to 123. The subject on which the Government had founded their principal arguments in favour of a Union was that of the Regency. The danger of a collision between the two countries on such an occasion was advanced as a principal cause for proposing the measure. Therefore, in order to remedy the difficulty (or rather to take away any serious argument, for it was nothing more), Mr. James Fitzgerald brought in a Regency Bill.

On the 11th of April, the House went into a Committee on the bill, which Lord Castlereagh most violently opposed. Mr. Foster (Speaker) being now out of the chair, availed himself of the opportunity, and made a most able speech against the Union, for the space of three hours. He replied to the statements made by Mr. Pitt in the British House of Commons, and to his attack on the Constitution of Ireland. The part regarding the trade and commerce of the country evinced his knowledge and research, he showed the rapid progress that Ireland had made since 1782, and the injury that would be likely to result from

the Union. He exposed the errors of Mr. Pitt, whose speech he termed "*a paltry production;*" and was most successful in his answer to Lord Castlereagh, who had denied that the Revolution of 1782 was a final settlement. A few passages are accordingly given :—

MR. FOSTER.—"Sir, I feel it almost impossible for me to refrain from expressing my deserved indignation, that a constitution which it was the pride of this nation to acquire—under which the country has so wonderfully thriven, and in the operation of which no one imperial difficulty has occurred,—that this constitution should be sacrificed, and with it the peace and prosperity of the country, to a theory which has every argument against and none for it, but the subjugation of Ireland to the uncontrolled views of a British Minister, which I trust will never be relished by Irishmen. * * *

"I shall go largely, before I sit down, into the adjustment of 1782; and I hope to show, to the satisfaction of every man who hears me this night, that those evils of which the noble Lord affects to complain have not sprung out of that adjustment, but that it has been the cure of every evil this country had to complain of, and which the Ministerial specific of a Union would again heap upon this kingdom; and in this opinion I am fortified by every Minister and Ex-Minister of that day. * *

"In the address from both Parliaments preceding the session of 1785, it was stated that there were necessary regulations of commerce affecting the two countries which had not been adjusted. Commercial arrangements were alone spoken of, and had there any measures of constitution remained unsettled, would they not have been adverted to? Would Mr. Pitt, who began his ministry soon after the final adjustment, and who was Minister in 1785—would he have sat quietly when such an opportunity offered of giving consideration to a constitutional question, if any had remained unsettled? But if anything could more than another show that the constitutional connection between the two countries was considered as finally settled, it is the unanimous address of the British Parliament, on that occasion moved by Mr. Pitt himself, and wherein are to be seen all those expressions, nearly word for word, which he now applies to the measure of a Union.

Wealth, consolidation, strength, glory, &c. &c., all were attached by him as necessary consequences of accepting the propositions; and now are shifted, but with very unhappy appropriation, to the measure of a Union. * *

"I respect Mr. Pitt as an English Minister, and give him willingly every credit for his financial talents; but I must say, as to the Irish nation he is the worst Minister that it ever heard of, and nothing but the utmost rashness could induce the man to disturb this country at such a period by the introduction of a measure which he must have been conscious could not have been received or treated of without the most alarming war of feeling. The charges against me contained in that speech must, if I could feel flattered by such a circumstance, have flattered me; for in a speech which occupied upwards of three hours, more than one-third of it makes me the subject, and is taken up with, I will not say designed, misrepresentations of what has been publicly said by me on different occasions, but particularly in the debate on the commercial propositions in 1785. (The Speaker stated that Mr. Exshaw, the king's printer, had received Mr. Pitt's speech to be published with the misrepresentations, but had corrected them subsequently on his application to him (Mr. Foster) on the subject.) * *

"I state these particulars to show on what grounds I presume that speech (10,000 of which have been distributed through the country) to have been printed by the authority of the Irish Government—a speech which I believe has disappointed very much the expectations of those by whom it was sent abroad; for I do not think its depth of reasoning, or its convincing display of advantages, such as to have produced a single proselyte to the doctrine of a Legislative Union. * * * *

From the period of 1782 to the present, there has not arisen with the Parliament of this country any political shock or concussion, save this desperate one—this fatal project of Mr. Pitt, to which various objects are assigned, but the real one is that Mr. Pitt finds that 300 Irish gentlemen, forming an Irish resident Parliament, hold the purse of the nation too fast in their honest grasp for him to dispose of it as he pleases. In the commercial propositions, an appropriation of

revenue was provided for to go to imperial expenses, but now no proportion of expense is named: you are not asked for any money; so you consent to resign your Constitution,—parting with that, it is too obvious that the other must follow. * * * *

On this occasion Lord Castlereagh went into a long statement of the affairs of the country: he calculated the value of imports into Great Britain from Ireland at 5,612,689*l.*, on which she raised a revenue of 47,562*l.*, whereas Ireland imported from England only 3,555,845*l.*, on which she raised a revenue of 643,148*l.* The yearly value of Irish manufacture exported to England he represented to be 5,510,825*l.*, and of English manufactures* exported to Ireland to be 2,087,672*l.* He took an average of seven years as to the linen trade, affirming that Ireland exported to Great Britain 35,648,706 yards of linen, and to the British colonies 1,259,868 yards—total 36,998,574; and to foreign countries she exported 4,762,684 yards, making a total of 41,670,654 yards. He then stated that the value of English woollens imported into Ireland for three years, ending 1793, was 599,974*l.*, and the average for three years, 1797, was 647,900*l.*; and at the same time the value of linen exported to Great Britain was 3,038,630*l.*, taking the linen at 10d. a yard on an average for seven years.

The bill went through a committee, and was ordered to be reported: it left the appointment of

* Compare this account with that in the Irish Railway Report of 1840, where the statement as to the trade and commerce of the country is set forth, and see there the decline of Irish manufactures, and the cessation of the progress that Ireland made after 1782.—See Irish Railway Report, compiled by the late lamented Secretary for Ireland, W. Drummond, there the fallacy of the above statement is clearly demontrated, and from which it will appear that the export trade of Ireland has not kept up its proportion, and in quality has not changed but deteriorated.

the executive magistrate to the British Parliament, and so far removed one of the grounds of difference that was supposed to exist between the two countries. On the 18th the report was brought up, when the subject of the Union was again gone through, and a most animated debate took place; but on the motion of Lord Castlereagh the bill was put off to the 1st of August: no division even took place, and thus ended the measure.

CHAPTER II.

Military force in Ireland at the period of the Union.—Martial law.—Cruel sentence on Devereux.—Indemnity bill.—Cases of torture known by the Government Trials.—Acquittal of Judkin Fitzgerald.—Lord Avonmore's charge.—Mr. Barrington's resignation as lieutenant of yeomanry.—Escheatorship refused to Colonel Cole.—Arts practised by Government.—Speeches of Plunket, Moore, and Ponsonby.—Ponsouby's attack on Lord Castlereagh.—House of Lords.—Amendment proposed by Lord Powerscourt against the Union.—Last letter of Lord Charlemont.—His death.—End of session of 1799.—Conduct of Lord Cornwallis.—Addresses in favour of Union.—Lord Donoughmore's conduct.—Orange Lodges hostile to Union.—Divisions sown among them and the Catholics.—Offers to the Roman Catholic clergy.—Resolution of the prelates.—Veto.—Catholics grossly duped.—Anecdote of Lord Cornwallis by Judge Johnson.—Catholics adverse to the Union.—Meeting and speech of Mr. Daniel O'Connell, barrister, against it.—Resolutions on the subject.

WHEN Lord Castlereagh moved the supply, on the 18th of February, 1799, he stated that the expense of the war establishment was 4,815,367*l.* for keeping up in Ireland a military force of 137,590 men, of which the regulars amounted to 32,281,—the militia to 26,654, the yeomanry to 52,274,*—

* The following authentic document shows the force and the means required to carry the Union:—

Regulars,	32,281	£1,218,955	0 0
Militia,	26,634	769,012	0 0
Yeomanry,	57,274	687,485	0 0
British,	23,201	666,799	0 0
Artillery,	1,500	Included in Ordnance and Commissariat Expense.	
Drivers and Commissariat,	1,700		
Total military force in Ireland	137,590!!!		
Serving abroad	3,234		
	140,824		

the entire to 138,000 men. Notwithstanding this overwhelming force, he said it was necessary to arm Government with stronger powers. With this view a bill had been introduced on the 20th of February, by the Attorney-General (Toler), entitled, "A Bill to suppress the Rebellion," though in fact the rebellion had long since been quelled, and the decaying embers alone remained, which time and gentle measures would gradually extinguish. The bill invested the Lord Lieutenant with discretionary power to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, and establish martial law; it empowered him to order all military officers, or any persons appointed by him, to suppress the Rebellion in the most summary manner they thought proper, by courts-martial, or otherwise, without any appeal to any legal tribunal; this was to be enforced against all concerned in, or in any way assisting, the Rebellion, or maliciously attacking or injuring the persons or property of his Majesty's loyal subjects, and was greatly extended by the power given to arrest any person upon *mere suspicion*. This severe, and most unconstitutional measure was supported by Lord Castlereagh, Dr. Duigenan, John Claudius Beresford, and Maurice Fitzgerald, knight of Kerry.

Accordingly, the entire county of Antrim was declared to be in a state of disturbance, and proclaimed by orders of General Nugent, and placed under martial law; the county of Mayo was also

Ordnance,	£442,659	0	0
Barracks,	350,000	0	0
Commissariat,	132,000	0	0
	£4,266,910	0	0
Miscellaneous, including 98,327 for troops serving abroad	549,457	0	0
	£4,815,367	0	0

proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant, and divisions of troops stationed in various quarters throughout the country. Trials by court-martial still continued. On the 21st of May the case of Walter Devereux occurred: he was accused of having been a leader in the insurrection the year before. He was tried by a military tribunal, and condemned to death. The sentence was singular and barbarous, — that the prisoner should be hanged; that he should have his head cut off, *his heart burned, and his body quartered.* This cruel and infamous sentence Lord Cornwallis, it is said, after mature deliberation, approved and confirmed! This was but one of the numerous instances of Lord Clare and Lord Castlereagh's system—their mode of governing Ireland,—their "*vigor beyond the law.*" It recalls to mind the case of Scotland, which affords, however, but a faint parallel:—after the rebellion in favour of the Pretender, in 1745-6, when Lord President Forbes remonstrated with the Duke of Cumberland against the outrages committed in the Highlands by his troops, and told him that his soldiers were breaking the laws, the Duke replied "*The laws, my lord; by G— I'll make a brigade give laws.*" Such was the case of Ireland; so that with perfect truth it has been said, that the object of the Government was to carry the Union by terror and intimidation. In furtherance of this project, Mr. Toler brought in an indemnity bill, on the 29th of April,—a measure well suited to the character of the author, and to the conduct pursued by the Government towards the people, but fatal to the reputation of the House of Commons. This bill indemnified all persons who had resorted to illegal measures against the insurgents. One of its provisions enacted that the jury should not convict if the magistrates could prove

that in what they had done they had acted for the purpose of suppressing the Rebellion. This measure having become law, presented an effectual bar to redress, and so it appeared to Lord Avonmore, who tried a case under it, and who expressed himself in a very remarkable manner on the occasion; thus, as far as regarded all those individuals who had suffered from the violent and illegal conduct of magistrates, it was a complete denial of justice, but as regarded the Legislature it set a seal on their conduct, and affixed upon its character an everlasting stain, which neither contrition nor time could efface. It was by measures such as these that the Government calculated on effecting their designs: by thus degrading the representatives in the eyes of the people, they knew the nation would soon become indifferent to their fate, and rather prefer their extinction to their existence; realizing the very words of Lord Clare, that "*he would make the people of Ireland sick of their Constitution.*"

The case of Matthew Scott, tried in 1799 before Mr. Justice Kelly, at Clonmel, is also illustrative of the character of the laws, and of the temper of those who administered them. Scott was a wealthy and respectable inhabitant of Clonmel—a man of large property, and high repute; he was imprisoned on a charge (totally false) of sending pikes in his boats that went laden with corn. Judkin Fitzgerald refused no less a sum than 100,000*l.* bail for him! and when applied to, swore "*By G—, he shall not be brought to trial!*" However, after much intercession in his favour, he was let out of jail on giving bail in the amount of 20,000*l.*: an action was brought against Fitzgerald, who relied on the indemnity act, protecting those who had acted since the 25th of October, 1798, for the suppression of the insurrection, and

the preservation of the public peace. Captain Jephson, who commanded a corps of yeomanry in the county, was examined on the trial, and swore that the conduct of Fitzgerald was the most infamous he ever witnessed, and such as if persevered in would assuredly ruin the country: that he had persecuted in a most oppressive and cruel manner, a man of the name of Wells, who was perfectly innocent, and what Fitzgerald had stated was utterly false; the *jury, however, found a verdict for Fitzgerald.**

Another case was that of Doyle, merchant and cloth manufacturer, of Carrick; it occurred in 1798, but the trial did not take place till 1801. Doyle had been arrested by Fitzgerald, tied up, and flogged; he could not endure the torture, and after 100 lashes he fainted. He was guilty of no offence, and accordingly brought an action. Fitzgerald defended himself; and in his speech disclosed some of his enormities, in which he seemed to glory: he stated, as a proof of his services, that he had arrested a Mr. O'Brien (whom he called colonel of the united party), to have him flogged. O'Brien made an excuse to retire, as he wanted to shave himself, and pretending to do so, *he cut his throat to avoid the horror and ignominy of the torture.* This act Fitzgerald gravely advanced as a defence to the action! He then gave a catalogue of the tortures he had inflicted: he had flogged many men on the 16th of May, at Nenagh; on the 23rd he had flogged a Mr. Fox, whom he called a general; a Mr. Quinn, whom he called a colonel; a man of the

* On this trial Captain Jephson stated that he had known some of the rebels who had given him information, one of them said he had tampered with the people of Carrick, and that he had found they would go great lengths for Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform, but when he sought to seduce them, and mentioned the subject of rising in arms, they to a man refused him!

name of Kearey, and a man of the name of Wells, a yeoman in Captain Jephson's corps; that Capt. Jephson had threatened he would get his men to fire on him, but "I defied him, and flogged Wells and two more men, THOUGH THEY WERE ALL INNOCENT!!"—these were his words; and it was for this man that the Attorney-General Toler (afterwards Lord Norbury) got the indemnity bill passed.

The reader must bear in mind that Lord Clare, Lord Camden, and Mr. Pitt denied such acts of torture had been used. Lord Camden, in his speech in the English House of Lords was express on this point, saying, "*nothing more than necessary was resorted to;*" but here appears the naked fact, proved by their friend and *protégé*, the man for whom was passed this very indemnity bill; here he comes forth, avowing and glorying in the fact, and adding this very remarkable note and comment, "THAT HE FLOGGED THEM, THOUGH THEY WERE ALL INNOCENT!" But another circumstance appeared on this trial: a disclosure was made which brings the guilt nearer to head-quarters. In his defence, Fitzgerald produced a letter, addressed to him, and signed by *Wm. Bagwell,* "*Brigade Major,*" dated 6th June, 1798,—a military man, and then in the employment of Government: in this letter, Bagwell informed Fitzgerald, "*that if he found any good to arise from flogging he might* GO ON *with it, but let it not reach my ears!!*" Well might Lord Camden say he knew nothing of flogging. The evidence given on this trial also, by Captain Jephson, is too important to be omitted, and serves to lift up the veil from the entire scene of these sanguinary government orgies: he swears, "I wrote to Government for troops, for two reasons; 1st, because I thought from Fitzgerald's conduct no loyal

yeoman would bear arms; this I feared *from the despair manifested by the inhabitants of the country on hearing of the flogging;* 2ndly, I was afraid *that not only the yeomen would not bear arms, but that the cruelty exercised in inflicting the torture would infuse a spirit of disloyalty into the most loyal,* and consequently encourage the most disaffected. *I am of opinion that Sheriff Fitzgerald's conduct was calculated to promote rebellion;* for had it not been for my being possessed with superior information, the oath of allegiance I had taken, the property I had in the country, and my being a captain of a yeomanry corps, *I would, on seeing such wanton cruelty, have joined the rebels!*"

Lord Avonmore, in charging the jury said, "Before the indemnity acts passed, no damages you could give would be too great, but if under these acts you believe the defendant was forced, through imperious necessity, to commit this abominable outrage against the plaintiff, (a man of acknowledged loyalty) you are bound to find for him: the information he acted on he has told you was that of *a vile, perjured, and infamous informer, and this too not upon oath!* To render a verdict for the plaintiff of any avail, you must find that the defendant acted maliciously, and not with the intent of suppressing the Rebellion, or of serving the state; such are the words of the Act, which places *an insuperable bar between injury and redress, and sets all equity and justice at defiance!*" at the same time he dashed the *Act upon the cushion, and threw himself back on the bench.* THE JURY ACQUITTED FITZGERALD!! upon which he took legal proceedings against the man he had so flogged, and recovered damages against him to the amount of 424*l.*, as by the law a verdict for defendant saddled the plaintiff with double costs.

What excuse could Mr. Pitt offer for these

proceedings?—treason was no apology for them. He did not treat the Irish as if they were Christians; they were not treated like rebel Christians, but like rebel dogs! It is not a matter of wonder that the country was driven into rebellion, but it is a wonder that any man remained loyal. What, not like our government!—flog him: not like our religion!—100 lashes: not like our uniform!—100 lashes more! not like our toasts!—*another* 100! Such were the principles of Government at this period, and to protect the exercise of them the Indemnity Bill was passed.

Government were aware that torture was inflicted, and Lord Clare had the boldness to justify it as the only means to extract information: that is, not to punish the guilty, but to punish men, perhaps innocent, in order to make them discover the guilty! Mr. (afterwards Judge) Fletcher, an excellent and humane man, who was counsel in Doyle's case, stated, that when the martial law bill was passed in England, it was proposed to introduce a clause against torture, but the Attorney-General opposed it, saying, "It cannot but be known to every one that neither martial law, nor any other law, human or divine, can justify the application of torture, or authorize its infliction."

The accounts of these horrors used to throw Mr. Grattan into a state of the greatest excitement, and affected him with spasms that convulsed his entire frame; then he would exclaim against the authors: "I cannot bear to think of it—it puts me in a horrid state. Pitt fermented the Rebellion to carry the Union. Yet I could forgive him the Union, for he was an Englishman, but I never can forgive the torture.* It is not

* In a conversation with the late Lord Holland on this subject, his remark was, "The Irish do not know how to plant the dagger."

over yet,—the people will not forgive it: when the recital even at this distance of time (1818) creates such sensation.—Men will not see the necessity, and will feel the disgrace."

In some men's minds there are limits to corruption and oppression, beyond which a love of interest, or even cruelty, will not lead them to pass. The conduct of the Government, and the violent and corrupt practices to which they resorted, induced Mr. Barrington to separate himself from that party, and to give up the commission that he held in the yeomanry, and he accordingly sent in his resignation. Unfortunately, he had supported the Government in several of their savage acts, and in many of their corrupt measures; he therefore lost much of the credit that would naturally have attended the expression of such just and honourable sentiments, as will be found in the letter that signified his retirement; it was a sign of the times, and is therefore worth exhibiting here.

MR. JONAH BARRINGTON TO MR. WILLIAM SAURIN.

Dublin, January 1799.

SIR,—Permit me to resign, through you, the commission which I hold in the Lawyers' Cavalry. I resign it with the regret of a soldier who knows his duty to his king, yet feels his duty to his country, and will depart from neither but with his life.

That blind and fatal measure proposed by the Irish Government to extinguish the political existence of Ireland—to surrender its legislature, its trade, its dearest rights, and proudest prerogatives into the hands of a British minister and a British council.

Consistent, therefore, with my loyalty and my oath, *I can no longer continue subject to the indefinite and unforeseen commands of a military government, which so madly hazards the integrity of the British empire, and existence of the British constitution, to crush a rising nation,* and aggrandize a despotic minister.

I never will abet a new developed plan, treacherous and ungrateful,—stimulating two sects against each other to enfeeble both, and then *making religious feuds a pretext for political slavery.*

Mechanical obedience is the duty of a soldier, but active, uninfluenced integrity the indispensable attribute of a legislator when the preservation of his country is in question; *and as the same frantic authority which meditates our civil annihilation, might, in the same frenzy, meditate military projects from which my feelings, my principles, and my honour might revolt,* I feel it right to separate my civil and military functions; and to secure the honest uninterrupted exercise of the one, I relinquish the indefinite subjection of the other.

I return the arms I received from Government. I received them pure, and restore them not dishonoured.

I shall now resume my civil duties with zeal and with energy,—elevated by the hope that the Irish Parliament will never assume a power *extrinsic of its delegation,* and will convince the British nation that we are a people equally impregnable to the attacks of intimidation as the shameless practice of corruption. Yours, &c.

JONAH BARRINGTON.
Lieut. 1st Cavalry.

To William Saurin, Esq., Commandant
Lawyers' Corps, &c., &c.

Among the many artifices resorted to by the Government to effect their object, the most unjust and the most glaring was that which occurred in the instance of Colonel Cole. It was an act of the greatest partiality and injustice. Mr. Cole was an anti-unionist; his regiment was quartered in Malta, and he was ordered to leave the country immediately and join it. His constituents in the county Louth were known to be inimical to the union, and had determined to elect Mr. Balfour, a person of similar principles with themselves. In order to prevent this, the Government refused to grant to Colonel Cole the office of Escheatorship of Munster, an office analogous to the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds, and therefore granted as a matter of course, and granted at

the same time to Mr. Oliver, the member for Kilmallock, that he might retire, and that a unionist might be returned in his place. This conduct drew down upon them the heavy censure of the opposition; the question was discussed on the 15th May, when Mr. Plunket, Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Moore, and Mr. Barrington, denounced the proceedings of Government in unsparing terms, and poured forth a torrent of bold and well-merited condemnation upon Lord Castlereagh. Mr. George Ponsonby was particularly severe, and drew forth a sharp and spirited reply. The motion for the writ, however, was carried; and the question of adjournment to the 1st June, proposed by Lord Castlereagh, passed by a majority of 47 to 33. The speeches delivered on this occasion are worthy of remark.

Mr. (afterwards Lord) Plunket:—

The noble lord at this moment exhibits a phenomenon unexampled in the history of any free country. After being baffled and disgraced in a vital measure, he continues to brave the Parliament and the public, and to tell them that that measure shall be carried, no matter by what means. I am told, Sir, that this question has no connection with the Union. I deny it. No two questions can be more essentially involved, because the noble lord by his silence on this night avows that he means by a barefaced exertion of prerogative to enforce this reprobated measure against the fair sense of Parliament and people, and therefore I will not tire the House by trying the merits of a question which has been already so amply discussed, and so explicitly reprobated. I will beg to call the attention of the House to the conduct of the noble lord and of the Government in the prosecution of it. This measure, Sir, was brought forward with but little interval indeed being allowed for the public to examine it before its introduction to the House. In that little interval, however, public scorn and indignation had attached upon it. But still *it was brought into this house accompanied by the execrations of the people of Ireland, but at the same time with the proud boast,* and I do believe with the childish hope

on the part of the noble lord that it would be carried by a triumphant majority. Of its fate I need not remind you; *it was flung out of Parliament with abhorrence.* How, Sir, was the majority formed by whom it was rejected? Was any man bribed to resist the Union? Was any man promised to resist the Union? Was any man dismissed from office, or threatened with dismissal, to make him resist the Union? Was any mean motive, or selfish interest, or sordid principle of the human heart, pressed into the service against the Union? No, Sir; it was dismissed and defeated by the instinct and the reason, and the virtue and the talents, and the property of the country. What was the consequence? Have the honourable men who were dismissed from office been restored? and has the absurd projector who failed in his rash experiment been dismissed? No, Sir; but the men who were turned out of office because they gave a wise and honest opinion, which has been confirmed by Parliament and by the nation, are kept out of office merely because they gave that opinion, and the minister, who brought forward this weak and wicked measure, after being disgraced and baffled, retains his place. I therefore repeat it, the noble lord exhibits a political phenomenon unparalleled in the history of any free country. In former times, when the minister has found the sense of the Legislature and the country against him, his measures have been abandoned, and he himself has sought safety and retirement. But here the minister retains his place, *and braves the Legislature, and braves the country, and avows his perseverance in the measure which they have trampled on, and avows his determination to carry that measure by means the most unconstitutional and shameless.*

Mr. Arthur Moore:—

Sir, there is no man who is an attentive observer of public occurrences, and who keeps an eye on the measures of the Administration, who must not have seen, and seen with affliction, that the measures which have been taken, and are now in daily and unremitting practice, to effectuate the Union, are such as no honest man can justify, which, while they stamp the authors of them with indelible disgrace, must render the incorporation of the Legislatures of the two countries, if carried, unpermanent, and the discontents and calamities of this nation eternal.

Was it not, Sir, enough that the whole authority of the Court, both ordinary and extraordinary, was exerted to bring about the measure, and that upon a full and fair discussion of its merits it was rejected by the unbought and uninfluenced sense of the representatives of the people. Was it not enough that since that period *the efforts of corruption have been redoubled, that promises are lavished, and stipulations made for offices and honours; that our liberties are brought to market overt, where every dishonest man may sell and buy, but where no honest man is permitted to show his face?* Is it not enough that the public sense is daily misrepresented by fables and false reports of change of sentiment, of conversion from error, of majorities in favour of the measure in this house? Is it not enough that the sister kingdom and the British cabinet are evidently and designedly misled and misinformed as to the real state of public opinion in this country? Is it not enough that the public money is perverted to the purpose of extinguishing the free and fair communication of opinion, and of corrupting the press to become the vehicle of false statement, of personal calumniation, and of libel of the Irish Parliament? Will not these means, these efforts content them? Are they not satisfied with having the purse and the power of the country in their hands, and actively employed in forwarding their views? Are they not content with purchasing the mercenary aid of every hireling scribbler, and circulating gratis the wicked, seditious,—nay, I think in some instances little, if at all, short of treasonable publications of interested or ignorant men, through the medium of the public post-office, to all parts of the kingdom, while the communication of every publication in favour of the legislative independence of Ireland is not only withheld but forbidden? Are they not satisfied to sap and undermine our constitution by the slow and silent approaches of unremitting corruption, but must it be boldly and opening assailed by an undisguised aggression upon the privileges and independence of Parliament. Sir, in my mind the statement which has been made by my honourable friend ought to raise the indignation of the House against those who have been the wicked advisers of so unjust and partial an exercise of a prerogative vested in the Crown for the purpose of guarding the privileges and securing the independence of the House of Commons? At any time,

or under any circumstances, the transaction which has been stated to have taken place between the executive Government and the honourable and gallant colonel would have been highly disgraceful to the Administration, and an unpardonable invasion of the privileges of this House; but that such conduct should be pursued at a time when the greatest and most important subject that ever agitated a free assembly is still suspended over our heads, and is we understand again to be brought forward; that the *practice* of ministers here should be so different from the professions of Mr. Pitt, who, in his speech on the Union, assures Great Britain and Ireland, and Europe, that the measure is not to be resumed unless called for by the free, uninfluenced, unequivocal sense and opinion of the Parliament and people of Ireland; that the people of both nations should be told from authority that *fair* means only are to be used when every foul means are practised; *that this House should be mocked and insulted from day to day with the insincere assurance that all that is sought for on the subject is the unbiassed sense of Parliament, at the same time that before a member is allowed to vacate his seat he must condition that his successor shall support the Union, is such a transcendant violation of Parliamentary freedom as this House ought not only to resent but to punish.* Sir, if this office of Escheatorship is to be disposed of by the Crown exclusively to those who will previously condition to support the measures of the ministry, the Place Bill, instead of being a means of securing the independence of Parliament, becomes at once a formidable instrument of ministerial influence and corruption, and instead of being a barrier of defence against the undue exercise of the prerogative, it legitimates its abuse, and forwards and facilitates its encroachments. Surely a bill which was sought for by the most popular character* in this country for years, which for so many sessions in former Parliaments was successively resisted by the Court, and perseveringly demanded by the country, but which was at length conceded as a sacrifice on the one side, and received as an acquisition on the other,—surely this popular statute will not now be said to authorize the evil it was enacted to remedy, namely, the grievous and enormous influence of the minister of the Crown over the representatives of the people in Parliament.

* Mr. John Forbes.

On the motion that the House should adjourn, Mr. George Ponsonby delivered a most animated and spirited speech, with more than ordinary fervour, and concluded as follows:—

Then, Sir, I am to understand the noble lord this House is to adjourn. Be it so; let the House adjourn; let the noble lord depart from this House at the head of his miserable majority, but let his character go along with him, let it stalk by his side, let it cling to him; *let it be understood by this House and by the country that all the noble lord's professions were hollow and hypocritical, the canting of a mountebank.* Swift, in his enumerations of the qualities requisite for a great statesman, says, that the first and most necessary is that his words should be applied to everything but the indication of his mind. However deficient the noble lord may be in every other qualification of a great statesman, he has certainly been most largely gifted with this. Let the House adjourn; but let it be understood by this House and by the country, that notwithstanding the solemn declaration of the noble lord in this house, that the measure of a Union (though considered by him as necessary to the prosperity of this country) should not be urged without their free *uninfluenced* consent. The noble lord has had recourse to the meanest and basest efforts, in direct contradiction to those professions. Let the House adjourn; *but let it be remembered that those powers which have been entrusted to the noble lord for the protection of the privileges and independence of Parliament have been perverted by him to the base and fraudulent purpose of packing that Parliament,* like a grand jury. Let the House adjourn; but let it be remembered that the noble lord is at the head of a great army; let it be understood that the object of the noble lord is to pack the Parliament for the purpose of carrying a vote in favour of this measure, and to enforce the vote of that packed Parliament by that army. Let the House adjourn; but let the character of the noble lord be fully understood, let it stick to him, let it be known that he is fair in profession, but foul in practice; let his character go to the people, let it be understood that after saying no further steps should be taken in this measure until this House and the country should have changed their minds, he has abused the power of the Crown to support him in

that very conduct—against which he stands so solemnly pledged. Let the House adjourn; the character of the noble lord and of his Government will go forth in their proper colours; let them persist in their system of fraud and corruption, it will avail them nothing when it is (as now it must be) perfectly understood; it will only confirm the opposition of this House and of the country to a measure, the iniquity of which is sufficiently characterised by the infamous means resorted to for its accomplishment.

Lord Castlereagh replied with spirit, but Mr. Ponsonby was prevented by the rules of the House from making any rejoinder. Thus this well-contested session terminated, and the House was abruptly prorogued. The Government failed in their object, and the question of Union was rejected. But the Lord-Lieutenant, in his speech from the throne, introduced the subject, and alluded to the addresses voted to his Majesty passed by both Houses of the British Parliament in favour of the measure.

It is a matter not less of wonder than regret that the proceedings of the House of Lords demand so little attention. This was the region of sober dulness and of sleepy silence—its inmates were the ghosts of politicians. The body had been long under the arrogant dictatorship of Lord Clare, whose imperious and angry sway kept it in perfect thraldom, so that even few scintillations of patriotism could appear. On some occasions a noble spirit, however, burst forth. Dixon, bishop of Down, Marley, bishop of Waterford (Mr. Grattan's uncle), Lord Moira, Lord Charlemont, Lord Mountmorris, resisted the iron rule of the Chancellor, though with less vigour than the exigences of the times required, and without that just severity and indignation with which the insolence of tyranny and the hatred of popular liberty deserved to be reprimanded.

On the 22nd of January, 1799, at the opening of

the session, Lord Ormond proposed the address, containing a passage favourable to the Union. He was seconded by Lord Glandore. This was opposed with considerable spirit by Lord Powerscourt,* who, with that attachment to his country which he uniformly manifested both in public and private, denied at once all right in the Parliament to entertain such a question as the Union, declaring its utter incompetence to part with the trust reposed in it; and he accordingly moved an amendment in those terms. This was rejected by 46 to 19.† The address was supported by Lords Clare, Glentworth, Carysfort, Bective, and Yelveston, who in this instance abandoned that dignified station that he had acquired in his early days, and tarnished the unpurchased laurels of 1782. The address was carried by 52 to 17.

In this list appears the venerated name of Charlemont. Faithful to his national feelings, true to his early principles, he opposed the destruction of that constitution he had so nobly contributed to obtain. His mind had expanded towards his Catholic countrymen, and he did not think that their admission to the Legislature required its transfer or its abolition. His conduct on this occasion met with the approbation of his country. Several addresses were presented to him in consequence, and, among others, one from the wealthy and populous city of Cork. As his reply was almost his last act on behalf of Ireland,

* This noble house shows the withering effects of the Union—two generations have departed since, the beautiful residence is deserted—a natural consequence of English education and Irish absentees.

† These names were as follows:—

Duke of Leinster.	Lord Mountmorris.	Lord Charlemont.
Lord Enniskillen.	Lord Granard.	Lord Bellamont.
Lord Belmore.	Lord Powerscourt.	Lord Arran.
Lord Dunsany.	Lord Mount Cashel.	Lord Cloncurry.
Lord Lismore.	Lord Castle Stuart.	

Bishops, Dixon (of Down), Marlay (Waterford and Lismore).

it is worthy of being placed in remembrance, and added to the records of his imperishable fame.

MY LORD,—You felt for your honour and your dignity, you knew your duty to your country, and therefore on the 22nd of last month nobly vindicated the independence of its Legislature. Your Lordship has proved yourself not only the hereditary counsellor of the State, but the hereditary and incorruptible guardian of the constitution. Such conduct will live in the hearts of your countrymen; they are grateful, and act with you. With that auspicious era when our constitution was immutably established, your name, my Lord, is inseparably connected. Your recent conduct will add new celebrity to a name endeared to your countrymen, and revered by the world.

Cork, Feb. 13th, 1799.

ANSWER.

GENTLEMEN,—Though utterly disabled by the miserable state of my health from expressing my gratitude in a manner any way satisfactory to myself, no malady can possibly prevent me from feeling in its full extent the obligation you have conferred by making me the medium of thanks to those noble personages who on a late occasion, however unsuccessfully, supported in the House of Lords what with you we must ever think the cause of our country. Your approbation gives additional weight to our sentiments, and adds to our confidence respecting the line of conduct we have hitherto pursued, and in which we are determined to persevere.

With every sincere acknowledgment for this, and for all your former favours, I join with my noble associates in having the honour to be, gentlemen, your most obliged and most faithful humble servant,

CHARLEMONT.*

Feb. 25th, 1799.

The interval between the session of 1799 and that of 1800 was not thrown away by the Government. Undeterred by the opposition they had met with, undismayed by the defeat they experienced, and unconcerned at the national indignation vented upon them, they still prepared further devices,

* After a severe attack of illness he expired in the month of August, 1799.

and proposed bolder and more effectual plans of operation. All that could be accomplished by gold or by iron, by bribes or by threats, or by promises, was set in motion; every effort was strained to bring round those who were disinclined, to seduce those who were hostile but necessitous, to terrify the timid, and bear down the fearless and those who had at heart the interest and independence of their country. The doors of the treasury were opened, and a deluge of corruption covered the land. The bench of bishops, the bench of judges, the bar, the revenue, the army, the navy, civil offices, military and naval establishments, places, pensions, and titles, were defiled and prostituted for the purpose of carrying the great Government object—this ill-omened Union. The Place Bill was scandalously abused in order to model the House of Commons; men who were hostile were let out—men who were friendly were brought in; both were bribed, the one for their silence, the other for their activity. The right of petition was grossly infringed; threats, inducements, and fabrications,* were resorted to; meetings were prevented by the military, and others overawed

* We, the undersigned freeholders and landholders of the county of Meath, finding our names, without our concurrence, affixed to a publication as our approving of the abominable measure of a Legislative Union, do hereby agree to prosecute, as far as the law will admit, the persons concerned in such an insolent imposition, and we do wish to have our names affixed and added to the petition given into the honourable House of Commons by our worthy member, Hamilton Gorges, Esq. Dated this 14th Feb. 1800.

Here followed a number of signatures.

We, the undersigned freeholders and landholders of the county Meath, having been imposed on by the false representation of the effects of a Legislative Union, which we were duped into a belief, by men whose rank in life ought to obtain our confidence, but whose conduct in that very transaction convinces us we have been imposed on. We do hereby retract our signatures to such an abominable measure, and request to be permitted to add our names to the petition given into the honourable House of Commons by our worthy member, Hamilton

by the presence of an armed force—others again by loaded artillery with matches lighted. Never in the annals of history can be found a greater combination of force, fraud, violence, bribery, and illegality. Sheriffs were nominated who prevented county meetings, and so little decorum or restraint was observed by the Government, that the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney-General did not consider it unconstitutional, indecent, or inconsistent with the duty or the dignity of their station, to affix their names to an address calling on the High Sheriff of one of the principal counties (Tipperary) not to convene a meeting of the freeholders to petition against the Union.

But to the honour of Ireland it must be recorded, that notwithstanding all this overwhelming influence, these unscrupulous, these unconstitutional proceedings, a most honourable and persevering resistance was offered, and the project of Union was steadily and nobly combated both within and without the doors of Parliament. To the treaty of 1782 there were but two dissentient voices in the House of Commons—to that of the Union there were 120; in 1782, twenty-six counties petitioned for the independence of Ireland—twenty-eight counties now petitioned against its extinction, of which twenty were unanimous; eight principal cities and towns; twelve municipal corporations; Dublin, and all the mercantile, the manufacturing, and trading extent of the kingdom. The petition of the county of Down contained 17,000 signatures against the Union, and the counter-petition but

Gorges, Esq., declaring our utter abhorrence to the measure of a Union; that we conceive it to be calculated for the destruction of our free country.

Dated this 15th Feb. 1800.

Here follow a number of signatures.

415.* Only 7,000 individuals petitioned in favour of the Union, and 110,000 freeholders and 707,000 persons signed petitions against the measure, and within doors the minister could not carry his measure by more than forty-two; and if all the votes had been given, his majority would have been considerably less. In the autumn of 1799, the Lord-Lieutenant made a tour through Ireland, and his partisans availed themselves of this opportunity to procure addresses to him from various towns and places through which he passed. The Hutchinson family were peculiarly active. Forgetful of the early reputation obtained by their father in supporting the rights and interests of his country, they deviated into other ways, and directed their attention to less extended and less elevated objects. Their connection with the Catholics had got for one branch of the family an influence which unfortunately was exerted on this occasion against the Constitution, addresses from some of that body were obtained through Lord Donoughmore's impolitic interference, and division was thereby sown among the Catholics.†

* The English landed proprietors and absentees petitioned in favour of the Union.

† At a General Meeting of the Roman Catholics of the city of Waterford and its vicinity, 28th June, 1799, PETER ST. LEGER, Esq., in the chair,

The following were appointed a Committee to prepare a Declaration on the measure of a Legislative Union:—Rev. Dr. Thomas Hearn, Thomas Sherlock, Esq., Edward Sheil, Esq., Jeremiah Ryan, Esq., Thomas Hearn, Esq., M.D.

Resolved, that the following declaration be adopted:—

The measure of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland having been recommended to the consideration of both his parliaments by our most gracious Sovereign, the common father of his people, we, his Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Catholics of the city of Waterford and its vicinity, have thought it incumbent upon us to make this public avowal of our sentiments on this important and interesting occasion.

We are firmly convinced that a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, founded on equal and liberal principles, and on a sense of mutual interests and affections, is a measure of wisdom

Thus did Lord Donoughmore seek to effect a most difficult object, and unite two things nearly incompatible—popularity and profit; and he most

and expediency for this kingdom, and will effectually promote the strength and prosperity of both, and we trust it will afford the surest means of allaying those unhappy distractions, and removing those penal exclusions on the score of religion, which have too long prevailed in this country, and by consolidating the resources of both kingdoms, oppose the most effectual resistance to the destructive projects of both foreign and domestic enemies.

Strongly impressed with these sentiments, we look forward with earnest anxiety to the moment when the two sister nations may be inseparably united in the full enjoyment of the blessings of a free constitution, in the support of the honour and dignity of his Majesty's crown, and in the preservation and advancement of the welfare and prosperity of the whole British empire.

Resolved unanimously, That Lord Viscount Donoughmore, the sincere and attached friend of the Catholics of Ireland, be requested to communicate these our sentiments most respectfully to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this meeting be given to Thomas Sherlock, Esq., for his public and spirited exertions in promoting this our declaration, and that he be requested to hand it to Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

(Signed by order) PETER ST. LEGER, Chairman.

Dublin Castle, July 16, 1799.

MY LORD,—I am directed by my Lord Lieutenant to request your Lordship will have the goodness to express to the Roman Catholics of Waterford the satisfaction his Excellency feels from their declaration of the 28th of June, which they desired your Lordship to lay before him, and which is so respectably signed.

The measure of a Legislative Union, upon just and liberal principles, between this kingdom and Great Britain, is near his Excellency's heart; he is convinced that nothing will so effectually tend to bury the religious animosities in oblivion which have unhappily prevailed in this kingdom —to conciliate the affections of all his Majesty's subjects to the mild government under which they live—to increase the happiness and prosperity of Ireland—and to augment the power and stability of the British empire.

I have the honour to be,
With the truest esteem and regard, my Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,
CASTLEREAGH.

Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

Cork, 5th August, 1799.

MY LORD,—Having had this day the honour to receive from your Lordship, and to lay before my Lord Lieutenant, the unanimous address of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the towns of Tipperary, Cahir, and their vicinities, I am commanded by his Excellency to express to them, through your Lordship, the pleasure he derives from the strong expressions of loyalty to his Majesty therein mentioned.

injudiciously attempted a proceeding that terminated in a manner very different from that which he expected, and which served but to entail disgrace upon the country and discredit upon the family to which he belonged. It subjected him personally to severe mortification, and exposed for a series of years to discomfiture and to defeat the party he had espoused, and thereby sought to elevate. Perhaps he secretly hoped to conduct and manage the Catholic cause, but in this he was mistaken, and was destined to meet with bitter disappointment. Session after session he experienced repeated discouragement; even *his friend*, the more intimate friend of his brother the General (the Prince Regent), deceived and abandoned him. At length the noble lord, irritated by resentment, was said to have assisted in preparing the celebrated *witchery resolutions*, as they were called, in which allusion was made to the private friendships and morals of the Prince. These were adopted by the Catholics, and in that quarter ruined their cause. The advice was injudicious, the mode of proceeding unfair, the error unpardonable, and the step irretrievable. The Prince never forgave the Hutchinsons or the Catholics; to the last he opposed their claims,* and he accompanied the act of Emancipation,

His Excellency enjoins me to add, that the primary aim of his administration is to consolidate the strength and resources of this kingdom with those of Great Britain, and by an irrevocable bond of amity and affection to fix the connection upon one solid and indissoluble basis. Persuaded that these essential objects can only be effected by a Legislative Union in which the interests, the property, and happiness of the whole empire are materially involved, your Lordship will have the goodness to convey to the respectable Roman Catholic inhabitants of the town of Tipperary, Cahir, and their vicinities, the gratification their unanimous declaration in favour of this measure has afforded him.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

E. B. LITTLEHALES.

Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

* Sir Robert Peel's statement, in Parliament, of his interview with King George IV.

when it was extorted from him, by a declaration, that as far as lay in his power he would not fulfil its provisions.* Lord Donoughmore died before 1829, and was destined to behold only the tergiversation of his friend, but not the emancipation of his countrymen. Both he and his brother deeply regretted their conduct at the Union.†

Let the examples that history thus affords be an everlasting lesson to all men, whether gifted with great cunning or extreme ambition, never to desert the cause of their country, or deviate from the honest straightforward path of public duty. In politics there is an *hereafter* upon earth as well as in heaven, and it will shortly appear in the case of Isaac Corry.

The policy of the Government and the efforts of their supporters was to foment fresh divisions, and increase those that already existed among the various parties that composed the Irish community; nor were those arts practised upon the Catholics only, the Orangemen were also applied to, and the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland was induced to issue a circular to their brethren stating the determination not to discuss the question of Union, and recommending the same course to all other lodges. This was done at the suggestion, it was said, of Mr. Beresford and Mr. Verner, the principal leaders of that body. The result was, that many of the lodges and the Orangemen throughout the country remained silent, and though sworn and bound by their oaths to uphold the constitution, they beheld in silence its violation. They were ready, indeed, to fight for a toast, but not for an object. The Grand Lodge of the county of Antrim made a

* The Memoirs of Lord Eldon,—the king's expressions.

† Lord Hutchinson used to say, "Grattan, I ought to be d——d for my conduct at the Union!!"

similar declaration; they declined to enter into the question, and advised their brethren to adopt the same course. Notwithstanding this, thirty-two Orange Lodges, in Down and Antrim alone, agreed to resolutions disapproving of these instructions, and declaring their right to discuss the question of Union. Many of these bodies assembled in various parts of Ireland in the months of February and March, 1800, and though late in the field they acted in a manner highly creditable, and adopted numerous resolutions full of spirit and nationality; among them were the following:—

Lodge, No. 989.—We declare, in our opinion, the proposed measure of an incorporate Union is destructive of our rights, liberties, trade, and commerce. We will persevere, legally, in opposing so destructive a proposition.

Lodge, No. 596.—Replete with affection to the people of England, we desire a union with their dispositions, manners, and dangers; but fraught with patriotic feelings similar to theirs, we do not choose to give up, nor will we relinquish, the kingdom which gave us birth, or the constitution under which we have so eminently thriven. That if, by force or sublety, we should be compelled to their destruction, we can never forget the violence or forgive the violators.

Lodge, No. 986.—We are of opinion that a Legislative Union with Great Britain is a measure subversive of our happy constitution as established in 1782, and destructive to the trade and prosperity of Ireland.

Lodge, No. 641.—Impressed with unshaken loyalty to our Sovereign, and attachment to our present constitution, as established in 1782, we feel ourselves called on to declare our sentiments on that destructive measure of a Legislative Union, as tending to cause a separation of the two kingdoms.

Lodge, No. 538.—As we have sworn to defend the present constitution as by law established, we will to the utmost of our power, by all constitutional means, as Orangemen, as freeholders, and as Irishmen, resist a Legislative Union, as being subversive of that constitution.

Lodge, No. 497.—That we are of opinion that a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland is a measure fraught with evil, destructive of our dearest rights, and subversive of the constitution which we hold ourselves bound to maintain, and hereby reassert our firm determination so to do.

Lodge, No. 651.—That we see with unspeakable sorrow an attempt made to deprive us of our constitution, our trade, our rising prosperity, and our exertions as a nation, and reducing us to the degrading situation of a colony to England.

The spirit of these resolutions did not extend, nor did these bodies manifest themselves in any other mode, or assume a bearing more bold and decided; the petty squabbles with their fellow-countrymen seemed to have disabled them from making a grand and national effort. The jealousies that subsisted between them and the Catholics could not be laid aside on the moment, and the differences between the members of their own body increased their difficulties and their supineness. Discord thus was sown among them, and the object of Government was accomplished, dividing the Orangemen as they had divided the Catholics.

Another step taken had reference to the Catholic clergy, as the former and successful one had reference to the laity. The Catholics were tampered with,—a bribe was held out to them,—a provision from the Government was offered to their clergy. Though this proposition came from the Ministers, it does not appear that they gave any direct pledge, or made any positive promise as to the Catholic question; but Mr. Pitt certainly led the people of Ireland to believe that, after the Union, the measure would be granted. In the transactions of private life it would be so considered; and in after times, when Lord Cas-

tlereagh, in the House of Commons, alluded to that period, he added—

I do not mean to say that many of the Roman Catholics did not form, and naturally form, sanguine hopes that *further political* indulgences would follow the Union, founding such expectation on several of the speeches delivered in Parliament at the time, and on the general language held.

He further said—

That he would be a base and ungrateful man if he were not readily to acknowledge that the Catholics had materially assisted in accomplishing the measure.

The laity had only been called on to sell their country, but the Catholic clergy were called upon, not merely to sell their country, but sacrifice their church, and a veto from the Crown on the appointment of their bishops was to be the equivalent for pay and pension. In an evil hour they consented, and gave up the Parliament and the veto when a stipend was offered. In January, 1799, the Roman Catholic prelates * met to con-

* The resolutions of the Irish prelates were the following :—

"At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates, held in Dublin on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of January, 1799, to deliberate on a proposal from Government for an independent provision for the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, under certain regulations not incompatible with their doctrines, discipline, or just influence—it was admitted :

"That a provision through Government for the Roman Catholic clergy of this kingdom, competent and secured, ought to be thankfully accepted.

"That in the appointment of the prelates of the Roman Catholic religion to vacant sees within the kingdom, such interference of Government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person appointed, is just, and ought to be agreed to.

"That to give this principle its full operation without infringing the disciple of the Roman Catholic church, or diminishing the religious influence which prelates of that church, ought justly to possess over their respective flocks, the following regulations seem necessary :—

"1st. In the vacancy of a see the clergy of the diocese to recommend, as usual, a candidate to the prelates of the ecclesiastical province, who elect him or any other they may think more worthy, by a majority of suffrages :—in the case of equality of suffrages, the presiding metropolitan to have a casting vote.

sider the subject; they agreed to the proposition, and ten Roman Catholic prelates, including the four Metropolitan Bishops, signed the declaration in its favour; but, fortunately for the country, this unholy bargain was not completed, and the Roman Catholic church remained free from the intrigues of the Government and the intermeddling of the Court.

There can be no doubt that the Catholics were intentionally and basely deceived, and that Lord Cornwallis was the direct participator in the fraud appears from the following facts, which are

"The candidates so elected to be presented by the president (the chairman) of the election to government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of the said candidate, *if no objection be made against him*, for appointment to the holy see, or return the said name to the president of the election for such transmission as may be agreed upon.

"*If government have any proper objections against such candidates, the president of the election will be informed thereof within one month after presentation, who, in that case, will convene the electors to the election of another candidate.*

"Agreeably to the discipline of the Roman Catholic church, these regulations can have no effect without the sanction of the Holy See, which sanction the Roman Catholic prelates of this kingdom shall, as soon as may be, use their endeavours to procure.

"The prelates are satisfied that the nomination of the parish priests, with a certificate of their having taken the oath of allegiance, be certified to government.

(Signed)

1. Richard O'Reilly, R.C.A.B., Armagh.
2. J. J. Troy, R.C.A.B., Dublin.
3. Edward Dillon, R.C.A.B., Tuam.
4. Thomas Bray, R.C.A.B., Cashel.
5. P. J. Plunkett, R.C.B., Meath.
6. F. Moylan, R.C.B., Cork.
7. Daniel Delany, R.C.B., Kildare.
8. Edmund French, R.C.B., Elphin.
9. James Caulfield, R.C.B., Ferns.
10. John Cruise, R.C.B., Ardagh.

"Dublin, 28th January, 1799.

"The prelates, assembled to deliberate on a proposal from Government of a provision for the clergy, have agreed that M. R. (Most Rev.) Dr. O'Reilly, M. R. Dr. Troy, R. R. (Right Rev.) Dr. Plunkett, and such other of the prelates *who may be in town*, be commissioned to transact all business with Government relative to the said proposal, under the substance of the regulations agreed on and subscribed by them."

here given as they were narrated by one of the parties concerned in the transaction, and who was desirous that they should be known. Mr. Robert Johnson voted for the Union and was created judge; he favoured the Catholics, and thought they had been deceived at the Union. Under these impressions he stated to the Author, in 1816, the following occurrence:—That he was one of twenty-five members in the Lower House who had agreed that they would oppose the Union if they found that the Roman Catholics were hostile to it, and that they would vote for the measure if the Roman Catholics were friendly to it; that, as the Catholics constituted the majority of the population, their wishes on a subject in which they were so deeply interested would guide them, and that their numbers (twenty-five) were certain to turn the scale on a division. Lord Cornwallis sent for Johnson, and he went to the Castle, accompanied by some of the twenty-five, and Lord Cornwallis declared that they were mistaken in their opinion as to the Catholic resistance; that "*they were betrayed by the Catholics,*" (such were the words) for that the Catholics would not hold out in opposition to the measure. The party took the assurance of the Lord Lieutenant, they believed his statement, and thus (said Johnson) we were dissolved.

The effect of these artful proceedings was quickly visible in the distrust and division that arose among the people, who had ever looked up to their priesthood with reverence and affection, but who now were led to view them with suspicion. In after times the enemies of the Catholics reviled and taunted both their clergy and laity for having given the measure their support; but if the matter be calmly considered it could not be expected that they would be very ardent

in defence of a body from whom and by whom they were excluded; the spirit of the people had been broken down by the Rebellion, and its events were fresh in their memory, and they could not so soon forget the conduct of the Parliament, therefore to abandon it was natural but not noble. Thus were the Irish entrapped and deceived, and the political juggle successfully played off upon all parties, Protestants, Orangemen, and Catholics, laymen and clergymen; the Minister led to the deception, and if he did not in express terms deceive them, he allowed them to deceive themselves. Justice, however, demands that their case should be fairly stated, and it must be admitted to the credit of the Catholics that the great mass was adverse to the measure, and though not as active in their opposition as they ought, yet, under all the circumstances of their situation, they cannot be said to have deserted the cause of the country; they were placed in a most extraordinary and difficult position, to stand up for a Parliament that refused their emancipation, and oppose a Parliament that *seemed to promise it.* The lash over their head, the bayonet at their breast; terror on the one hand, temptation on the other; truth and virtue scarce anywhere to be found. Great bodies have not always prudence, still less philosophy, and not always patriotism.

Their chiefs held a meeting in Dublin in January, 1800, which has become remarkable in consequence of the first appearance of an individual whose name has acquired such celebrity, and who has since taken so fearless and uncompromising a part on behalf of the liberties of Ireland—Daniel O'Connell. This was the commencement of his public life, and his first speech deserves to be noticed; in the journals of the day it is thus given:—

Counsellor O'Connell rose, and, in a short speech, prefaced the Resolutions. He said that the question of Union was confessedly one of the first importance and magnitude. Sunk indeed in more than criminal apathy must that Irishman be, who could feel indifference on the subject. It was a measure to the consideration of which we were called by every illumination of the understanding, and every feeling of the heart. There was therefore no necessity to apologise for the introducing the discussion of the question amongst Irishmen. But before he brought forward any Resolution, he craved permission to make a few observations on the causes which produced the necessity of meeting as Catholics—as a separate and distinct body. In doing so, he thought he could clearly show that they were justifiable in at length deviating from a resolution which they had heretofore formed. The enlightened mind of the Catholics had taught them the impolicy, the illiberality, and the injustice of separating themselves on any occasion from the rest of the People of Ireland—the Catholics had therefore resolved—and they had wisely resolved—never more to appear before the public as a distinct and separate body—but they did not—they could not then foresee the unfortunately existing circumstances of this moment. They could not then foresee that they would be reduced to the necessity either of submitting to the disgraceful imputation of approving of a measure as detestable to them, as it was ruinous to their country—or once again—and he trusted for the last time—of coming forward as a distinct body.

There was no man present but was acquainted with the industry with which it was circulated that the Catholics were favourable to the Union:—in vain did multitudes of that body in different capacities express their disapprobation of the measure; in vain did they concur with others of their fellow-subjects in expressing their abhorrence of it—as freemen or freeholders—electors of counties or inhabitants of cities—still the calumny was repeated; it was printed in journal after journal; it was published in pamphlet after pamphlet; it was circulated with activity in private companies; it was boldly and loudly proclaimed in public assemblies.—How this clamour was raised, and how it was supported, was manifest—the motives of it were apparent.

In vain had the Catholics individually endeavoured to resist the torrent.—Their future efforts as individuals would

be equally vain and fruitless—they must then oppose it collectively.

There was another reason why they should come forward as a distinct class, a reason which he confessed had made the greatest impression upon his feelings; not content with falsely asserting that the Catholics favoured the extinction of Ireland, this their supposed inclination was attributed to the foulest motives—motives which were most repugnant to their judgments, and most abhorrent to their hearts; it was said that the Catholics were ready to sell their country for a price, or what was still more depraved, to abandon it on account of the unfortunate animosities which the wretched temper of the times had produced—can they remain silent under so horrible a calumny? This calumny was flung on the whole body—it was incumbent on the whole body to come forward and contradict it; yes, they will show every friend of Ireland that the Catholics are incapable of selling their country; they will loudly declare, that if their emancipation was offered for their consent to the measure, even were emancipation after the Union a benefit, they would reject it with prompt indignation. (*This sentiment met with approbation.*) Let us, (said he,) show to Ireland that we have nothing in view but her good, nothing in our hearts but the desire of mutual forgiveness, mutual toleration, and mutual affection; in fine, let every man who feels with me proclaim, that if the alternative were offered him of Union, or the re-enactment of the penal code in all its pristine horrors, that he would prefer without hesitation the latter as the lesser and more sufferable evil; that he would rather confide in the justice of his brethren the Protestants of Ireland, who have already liberated him, than lay his country at the feet of foreigners. (*This sentiment met with much and marked approbation.*) With regard to the Union, so much had been said—so much had been written on the subject, that it was impossible that any man should not before now have formed an opinion on it. He would not trespass on their attention in repeating arguments which they had already heard, and topics which they had already considered. But if there was any man present who could be so far mentally degraded as to consent to the extinction of the liberty, the constitution, and even the name of Ireland, he would call on him not to leave the direction and management of his commerce and

property to strangers over whom he could have no control.

He then concluded by moving the resolutions.

Even in these last moments of their national existence, attempts were made to prevent the meeting of the Catholics, and the military here interfered with a view to intimidate them; but Lord Cornwallis was applied to, and it was permitted to proceed. Such was the state of sufferance to which the people were reduced, and under which they were allowed, but only for a few moments longer, to hold the lingering remnant of their expiring liberties. The resolutions deserve to be remembered:—

Resolved, That we are of opinion that the proposed incorporate Union of the Legislature of Great Britain and Ireland is in fact an extinction of the liberty of this country, which would be reduced to the abject condition of a province surrendered to the mercy of the Minister and Legislature of another country; to be bound by their absolute will, and taxed at their pleasure, by laws in the making of which this country would have no efficient participation whatsoever.

Resolved, That we are of opinion that the improvement of Ireland for the last twenty years, so rapid beyond example, is to be ascribed wholly to the independency of our Legislature, so gloriously asserted in the year 1782, by the virtue of our Parliament co-operating with the generous recommendation of our most gracious and benevolent Sovereign, and backed by the spirit of our people, and so solemnly ratified by both kingdoms as the only true and permanent foundation of Irish prosperity and British connection.

Resolved, That we are of opinion, that if the independency should ever be surrendered, we must as rapidly relapse into our former depression and misery; and that Ireland must inevitably lose with her liberty all that she has acquired in wealth, industry, and civilization.

Resolved, That we are firmly convinced that the supposed advantages of such a surrender are unreal and delusive, and can never arise in fact; and that, even if

they should arise, they would be only the bounty of the master to the slave, held by his courtesy, and resumable at his pleasure.

Resolved, That having heretofore determined not to come forward any more in the distinct character of Catholics, but as involved in the general fate of our country, that we now think it right, notwithstanding such determinations, to publish the present resolutions, in order to undeceive our fellow-subjects who may have been led to believe, by a false representation, that we are capable of giving any concurrence whatsoever to so foul and fatal a project; to assure them that we are incapable of sacrificing our common country to either pique or pretension; and that we are of opinion that this deadly attack upon the nation is the great call of nature, of country, and posterity, of Irishmen of all descriptions and persuasions, to every constitutional and legal means of resistance; and that we sacredly pledge ourselves to persevere in obedience to that call as long as we have life.

Signed by order,

JAMES RYAN.

Dublin, January, 1800.

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Grattan's difficulty of getting a seat in Parliament.—Conduct of opposition.—Peter Burrowes's plan to appeal to yeomanry.—Sheridan's words on the Union.—Arthur Wellesley's (Duke of Wellington) opinion on Union.—Mr. Foster's difficulty as to the Catholics.—Letter from Lord Downshire and Charlemont.—Three plans for opposing the Union; purchasing seats; writing pamphlets; personal conduct.—Mr. Grattan elected for the town of Wicklow.—Going to the House.—Parting with Mrs. Grattan.—*Her spirited words.*—Sir Laurence Parson's amendment.—Speeches of Plunket, Fitzgerald, Moore, Ponsonby, and Bushe.—Mr. Grattan's entrance into the House.—Sensation produced.—His appearance and conduct.—Speaks.—Corry attacks him.—Arbitrary conduct of Government.—Post troops at the Houses of Parliament.—Meetings of the people stopped by the military.—Major Rogers threatens to blow the Court House about the ears of the freeholders in the King's County, 5th Feb.—Mr. Grattan's speech against Union.—Attacked a second time by Corry.—Government press on the question.—No regard paid to the Committee on Trade and Manufactures.—House in Committee.—Mr. Corry attacks Mr. Grattan.—His reply.—They leave the House.—Corry's character and conduct.—Corry's friendship.—His verses on Mr. Grattan.—Account of the duel by Mr. Grattan.—Sheriff held by General Cradock till the parties fought.

At this time it was a matter of considerable difficulty to procure a seat in Parliament. The Government had refused to grant the formal and usual facilities to such members as were desirous of retiring, being constantly on the watch to prevent the return of an anti-union member, as in the case of Col. Cole, before spoken of.

The introduction, therefore, of Mr. Grattan into Parliament was not easy to be effected, though very eagerly sought for by some of his friends who were most inveterate in their opposition to the Union, and who perhaps thought he would be

able to resist it with success, and give new spirit to the opposition. But it was too late; times had greatly altered since Mr. Grattan had left Parliament (in 1797). Parties, too, had assumed a different character; many favouring the Government in general, though opposed to them on this particular subject; Orangemen and Anti-Catholics seated by the side of Reformers and Emancipators; John Claudius Beresford and Mr. Foster acting with Mr. Ponsonby and Mr. Plunket.

This ill-assorted mixture required a skilful and plastic hand to mould together into a solid and united body, so as to call forth an effectual national resistance to the measure; but there was no one influential enough for the task. Lord Charlemont was gone.* His successor was young, and though well disposed and firm in his opposition, had not the benefit of experience. Mr. Ponsonby retained the habit of the law courts—not even those of the forum; and lacked those commanding qualities to form a centre round which a nation could rally. And above all, Mr. Foster, though sincere and zealous in his opposition, was not liked by the people, nor trusted by the Catholics. He had been long their opponent; and the measure of Union being artfully represented as likely to prove favourable to their claims, had made some doubt his sincerity, others surprised at his opposition; but that he was sincere cannot be disputed. At the same time he was informed by the Government, that if the measure passed he was to be provided for by one of the best situations in England.

Various were the plans proposed to counteract and defeat the Minister.

Mr. Peter Burrowes suggested a measure that

* He died in August, 1799, regretted by all, and by no one more than by Mr. Grattan.

might have proved successful, but he did not press it as much as it should have been, nor as much as he desired. At one of the meetings of the Anti-Union party, he proposed that an appeal should be made to the yeomanry; that they should call on them by virtue of their oath, in which they had sworn that they would uphold the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, and by which consequently they were bound to oppose such a measure as the Union. He urged the members of the Opposition to avail themselves of this oath, and circulate their appeal from the Lawyers' Corps to every corps in the kingdom. This would have given the proceeding a legal character and sanction, and have tended to make it more solemn and obligatory, coming with the recommendation of a grave and legal body. However, Mr. Saurin, Mr. Foster, and others, were opposed to it, and induced Mr. Burrowes to abandon the measure. He always considered this to have been a fatal decision, and regretted that he had not been allowed to press his resolution and carry it, which he seemed fully convinced he could have done. Government appeared to have apprehended that such a step might be taken, and signified their disapprobation of some corps that had expressed their opinion on the subject of the Union. Several years after this Mr. Burrowes was in company with Mr. Marsden, who had been Under Secretary at the period of the Union, and he mentioned these circumstances to him, and asked his opinion as to the probable result, and what the Government would have done if the Opposition had taken any strong measure of that sort. Marsden thought that they would have yielded, and would not have pressed the Union; that Lord Cornwallis and the Government were afraid lest the people would rise in arms ... that they had just

put down one insurrection which had been very near succeeding, and they dreaded another; and he added, that this was Lord Cornwallis's feeling.

It is possible that Lord Cornwallis might have yielded. He was friendly to the Catholics, and was a liberal man; but he was a soldier—a class not over fond of public liberty, nor accustomed to favour deliberative assemblies; but the more likely on that account to concede to a military summons such as Burrowes proposed.

Such are the chances upon which the success or failure of the greatest events depend. It is possible, that if two or three courtiers had been killed the Union might have been prevented. Lord Ely and Lord Clare would have been intimidated, and Mr. Pitt might have been frightened. A very little thing would probably have stopped the measure. However, these were not the olden times, as in Rome, when a patriot drew his sword and killed a magistrate; then brandishing it, appealed to the people that he had slain a traitor!

Unquestionably Lord Clare and Lord Castlereagh deserved to die. The popular execution of such State criminals would have been a national as well as a noble judicial sentence.

Some weak old women might have cried out "murder!" but it would have been the deed of a Brutus; and in the eyes of posterity the people would have been justified, for the Union was a great and legitimate cause for resistance. Sheridan, in a conversation he had with Mr. Grattan on the subject, exclaimed, "*For the Irish Parliament I would have fought England—aye, I would have fought up to my knees in blood!*"

There can be no doubt, that when the Parliament voted the Act of Union, the people had a right to march into the House and declare it had forfeited its trust;* but the reason they did not do

* See Vattel, Burlemachi, Grotius, Locke on Self-Government, &c.

so was, that the country was not accustomed to consider itself free—it doubted whether it possessed the power. Judging, too, from their former conduct, it is probable that the army would have been let loose on the people; for the Government were desperate, and they had an old general at its head. Even Arthur Wellesley (Duke of Wellington), at that time in India, had written to his friends in Ireland, and said, "*There must be no more debating societies in Ireland!*" * The feeling was very strong against the Parliament. But the great misfortune of the crisis was to be found in the situation of the leaders of the Opposition. Lord Charlemont had expired; Mr. Grattan had been long absent, was not in Parliament, and still remained in very feeble health; Mr. Foster was neither liberal nor popular, and was considered by the Catholics as hostile in the extreme. It was not possible to oppose such a measure as the Union without calling in aid all the people. Mr. Burrowes had proposed that the chief Catholics should meet the leaders of the Parliamentary Opposition, and that both should act in concert. He applied to the principal men, Messrs. Sweetman, Byrne, Teeling, and others. They were willing to join, as they were all against the Union, and would have acted with energy if the Opposition party had assented; but Foster and others refused to join them, and the negotiation broke off. In fact, Foster was the clog that impeded the movements of the Opposition. He subsequently saw his error, and in a conversation with Mr. Plunket he said, "*If the crisis demanded it, he would even go the length of calling in the aid of the Catholics!*" But the die was cast; it was too late; his penitence was in vain. Thus do preju-

* Letter to the Rev. William Elliot, rector of Trim, to whom he was greatly indebted for his election for that borough.

dice and bigotry possess a certain suicidal quality, which makes them finally become the victims of their own egregious folly. Foster's intolerance lost the warm heart and the bold active co-operation of the Catholic party; and to a conceited and interested religious theory he sacrificed the Constitution of his country.

An appeal was, however, made to the people; and a letter was issued from the Opposition leaders, and circulated through the country:—

Dublin, January 20th, 1800.

SIR,—A number of gentlemen of both Houses of Parliament, of whom thirty-eight represent counties, have authorized us to acquaint you, that it is their opinion that petitions to Parliament declaring the real sense of the freeholders of the kingdom on the subject of a Legislative Union, would at this time be highly expedient; and if such a proceeding shall have your approbation, we are to request you will use your influence to have such a petition from your county without delay.—We have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient, humble servants,

DOWNSHIRE.
CHARLEMONT.
W. B. PONSONBY.

Simple as this proceeding was, it drew from Lord Clare a torrent of invective, and he levelled against the individuals who signed the letter, one of his usual intemperate phillipics, couched in terms of exceeding rancour and virulence, but showing, however, a sense of danger, and the fear that Government entertained from that quarter, if the people (as they ought to have done) had risen in arms to oppose the measure.

One of the plans adopted and acted on by the opposition, was to bring into Parliament members to vote against the Union; it amounted in fact to a project to outbuy the minister, which in itself was unwise, injudicious, and almost impracticable, and in which they were sure to be far behind the Government; a second plan was their

literary war; this, as far as it went, was good, but it came too late, and was too feeble a weapon at such a crisis; the third plan was to meet the Castle club, and fight them with their own weapons; this would have proved the most effective and deadly of the three plans, but it was hazardous,—and in principle it could scarcely be sanctioned, and was acted on but in one instance (that of Mr. Grattan and Mr. Corry), and the meeting at Charlemont House* rejected it. To carry into effect the first of these measures, a subscription was opened; the names set down were numerous, and the sums considerable: in a short time 100,000*l.* was subscribed. Lord Downshire put down his name for 1000*l.*, W. B. Ponsonby, 500*l.*, George Ponsonby, 500*l.*, and many others for sums equally large; but the application of these sums was difficult, and the process was troublesome and tedious. Mr. Thomas Whaley had in 1799 voted for the Union; he paid 4000*l.* for his election for the town of Enniscorthy; he was not in affluent circumstances, but well inclined to oppose the Union, and Mr. Goold accordingly agreed that these expenses would be paid if he would vote against the Government. He did so, and when the division took place on the question in 1800, Mr. Cooke, the acting man for Lord Castlereagh in the traffic of members, perceived him staying in the House, and said, "*You are mistaken—the ayes go out.*" Mr. Whaley replied, "*Yes, but I vote against the Union.*" Cooke was surprised, but suspected the cause; and the next day he went to him, and offered him (to use his expression) "*a carte blanche;*" but Mr. Whaley would not break the promise he had made to the opposition: the funds, however, were soon exhausted, and a member who would have opposed the Union was lost in consequence, and voted for

* Sir Jonah Barrington's Memoirs of the Union, vol. ii.

it. The payment of the 4000*l.*, that was the sum stipulated in Mr. Whaley's case, was not easily procured. Mr. Thomas Goold had, highly to his honour, out of his own funds advanced the money, and an execution was served on his house; being unable to answer this sudden demand, Mr. Goold applied to the party, and George Ponsonby (who in such cases was not only generous but noble) immediately gave him an order on the bank (as he stated) "*for a splendid sum.*" Lord Lismore gave 500*l.*, Denis Bowes Daly gave 500*l.*, and in this manner Goold was reimbursed. This single instance shows the difficulty the ante-union party had to encounter, and how unlikely it was they could have succeeded by following such a plan.

Their next measure—the literary proceedings—consisted in getting together a number of men to write against the Union; however, this could avail but little; the time was too short; public opinion was at too low an ebb, and literature not widely enough circulated. The essays that appeared were undoubtedly good, and may have produced some effect: various were the styles that were used; among them satire proved the best. The party patronized the "Constitution" paper, and set up the "Anti-Union." It was in the latter that they chiefly wrote, and in the former that their speeches were chiefly published. Mr. Peter Burrowes, Mr. Plunket, Mr. Bushe, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Goold, and Mr. Smiley, were the chief contributors to the "Anti-Union." Mr. Thomas Wallace had been just called to the bar—an active, talented, and rising young man, fond of books, and likely to be of use. To him Mr. Burrowes applied, and without previous acquaintance, proposed that he should join the Society: he did so, and wrote extremely well. Mr. Plunket was said to be the

author of the article entitled "*Sheela.*"* Mr. Charles Bushe wrote the one entitled the "*Hacks.*" Several were from the pen of Mr. Burrowes; amongst them, that which considered the probable effect that the Union would have upon the representation of England, was written by him; it is headed "*Quinetiam mortua jungebant corpora vivis,*"—it is an able and powerful production: all this, however, was a very feeble instrument to wield against a Government that was corrupt in the extreme, and against an army that was all powerful. As to the pamphlets, they teemed forth without number: among the best were those written by Charles Bushe,† Thomas Goold,‡ William Drennan,§ and Mr. Taaffe:‖ in one month upwards of thirty pamphlets appeared on this subject. Doctor Drennan was a Presbyterian, full of talent and of spirit; his mind was patriotic and erudite. He wrote some beautiful poems, and many prose and political works. "*The Letters of Orellana,*" Addresses to the Volunteers, and his Essays on Home Education, are remarkable. He died in February 1820.

Had the third plan been acted on, the Government might have rued the consequences, but could not have complained, as it would merely have been following out the principle laid down by the Castle. A meeting of the friends of the Government had been convened, and the persons who were to support the several articles of Union were brought forward. Several members spoke on the occasion, and amongst them was Mr. St. George Daly: he was one of the boldest, particularly active, and quite decided. He declared

* Second vol. Dublin Magazine for 1799 and 1800.

† "Cease your funning, or the rebel detected," an excellent piece of satire, was attributed to Mr. Bushe.

‡ Aristarchus to the people of Ireland.

§ Letters to Pitt.

‖ Taaffe was a Franciscan friar.

(these were his words) "*that his line had been taken,** *and that each of them must select their man; and that he had chosen his antagonist already.*" It was said they had singled out their men;—that Lord Castlereagh should attack George Ponsonby; Corry, Mr. Grattan; Daly, Mr. Plunket; Toler, Mr. Bushe; and Martin, Mr. Goold. These individuals had been set on by the Castle, and encouraged to fight, and they did very well what they were paid for. St. George Daly gave battle at once; he was brave, but corrupt. Toler, the Attorney-General, was always ready; he was a blusterer and a villain, but always brave: Corry, too, was stout, but was put up to what he did. Henry Deane Grady was talkative, and somewhat bold. Martin showed courage, and seemed ready for fighting, and would have been considered fond of it were it not that he talked too much on the subject. Lord Castlereagh was rather cold to be a warrior, and, according to the language used by his friends, was said "*to have a soft hole in him.*" They were bold in the aggregate, and were better bullies by far than the opposition.

After the meeting of the Castle (the pistolling) Club (such is the name it deserves), a meeting of the opposition members was held at Lord Charlemont's to consider what should be done; a similar mode to the Castle plan was proposed, but objected to, and after discussion, was rejected. Sir Jonah Barrington, in his history, alludes to it, and intimates that neither he nor Mr. Grattan were very averse to the proposition.

The true course of the opposition (whose persons were thus assailed by assassins, while their Constitution and liberty was menaced by corruption, intrigue, and violence), was to have met the

* This was related to the author by one of the persons who heard the expressions used.

attack by war. They should have kept their ground in the senate, lest it might be used against them; but their councils should have been military: their speeches should have yielded to adjutant-generals' reports,—and leaving the pistol to bullies, they should have stood in hand at the head of the people, and have rescued their country. But, unfortunately, when the Insurrection was put down, the country was put down, and honest men, and men of spirit even, were afraid to move.

To mingle in the fatal broils, and to make a stand in this deadly contest, was now the fate of Mr. Grattan; and he was scarce equal to the task: he had come over late from England, and did not know the feelings of the people, or of parties. A year's absence had made great changes. He had escaped from the plots of his enemies by singular good fortune, though he could not escape from their calumnies; these he disregarded, for his conscience was clear, and his conduct above reproach; the only concern he felt was for his country, and to serve her appeared to him almost impossible. At the close of 1799 he returned from the Isle of Wight, and retired to Tinnehinch, almost broken-hearted,—not only hopeless, but helpless; enfeebled in body, and depressed in spirits, but in mind still unsubdued. Immediately on his arrival, a deputation from his friends waited on him to request that he would re-enter Parliament; but he was obliged to decline the offer in consequence of the state of his health. Soon after they informed him that a seat was vacant, Mr. Gahan, one of the members for the town of Wicklow having died, and Mr. William Tighe, the patron of the borough, would not be averse that he should be returned for it. Mr. Arthur Moore, a most zealous and sincere friend of Mr. Grattan, was very anxious on the occasion,

and pressed him strongly to comply: he knew that it was difficult to procure a seat, and exerted himself, in the most anxious and affectionate manner, to secure it for him, the more so as some of his own party were desirous of obtaining it for another person. Mr. Moore at length succeeded, and arranged that Mr. Grattan should be put in nomination. Mrs. Grattan's account of the circumstance, as nearly as can be recollected, was as follows: "Mr. Grattan's health did not permit him, and his sentiments did not incline him, to get into Parliament: he said that he would be no party in any way to the act of Union; that the representatives had no right to part with the legislative body, and that it *was an act of suicide.* I urged him most earnestly to take the seat; that he should not refuse; that it was his duty to go into Parliament; that he had got a great deal from the people; that they had given him a large sum of money in '82 for standing by them in time of need, and that it was his duty to do so now; and that he ought to spend his money, and shed his blood in their defence! (noble words—splendid sentiment). At length Mr. Moore and I prevailed. Mr. Grattan yielded, and we brought him to Dublin. Being unable to bear any noise, we avoided hotels, and went to a friend's house (Mr. Austen's) in Bagot Street. There he remained till the election should be over, as the party were very anxious that he should be present at the meeting of Parliament, which was to open on the 15th. Mr. Henry Tighe managed the business very dexterously: he was a person of spirit, hostile to the Union,—and proved himself to be zealous and useful. When he found that his brother had accepted 1,200*l.* for the seat, he was indignant, and said that he should have been too happy to have given Mr. Grattan the seat, in order to oppose such a measure. The Sheriff

being friendly, he allowed the election to be held after 12 o'clock on the night of the 15th. Mr. Tighe got the officer to sign the return, and set off immediately, on horseback, with it. He arrived in Dublin about five in the morning, when we heard a loud knocking at the door. Mr. Grattan had been very ill, and was then in bed, and turning round he exclaimed, '*Oh, here they come; why will they not let me die in peace?*' The question of Union had become dreadful to him; he could not bear the idea, or listen to the subject, or speak on it with any degree of patience; he grew quite wild, and it almost drove him frantic. I shall never forget the scene that followed. I told him he must get up immediately, and go down to the House: so we got him out of bed, and dressed him. I helped him down stairs; then he went into the parlour and loaded his pistols, and I saw him put them in his pocket, for he apprehended he might be attacked by the Union party, and assassinated. We wrapped a blanket round him, and put him in a sedan chair, and when he left the door I stood there, uncertain whether I should ever see him again. Afterwards, Mr. M'Can came to me and said that I need not be alarmed, as Mr. Grattan's friends had determined to come forward in case he was attacked, and if necessary take his place in the event of any personal quarrel. When I heard that, I thanked him for his kindness, but told him '*My husband cannot die better than in defence of his country.*'"

Genuine offspring of patriotism and of virtue, worthy of the race of the Geraldines!—honour to the possessor of that lofty mind, those elevated feelings, that sober consciousness of right, that just ardour in an honourable cause; uniting the love of country to the love of virtue, and the dignity of one sex to the softness of the other. Such are the divine qualities that adorn human kind—

ennoble our nature, and make life immortal. If spirits like these had found imitators, or magic words such as these met an echo through the land, Ireland would still have been a nation,—she would have preserved her Constitution, and her children their character.

On the 15th of January, 1800, the Irish Parliament met for the last session. According to Dr. Lucas, and the charter of Henry II., legislative assemblies had been summoned in Ireland since the eleventh century, but seldom had been suffered to exist in an independent state: they had attracted the jealousy of their more powerful rival, and now became victims to her overweening ambition, and their own unhappy divisions. In order to procure the return of new members, not less than twenty-five writs were moved for on the first day of the session—such being the success of ministers in their efforts to model the House of Commons. In the speech from the throne, Lord Cornwallis did not allude to the Union, but it was well known that the subject would be renewed, and pressed with all the energy that Government possessed. Sir Laurence Parsons therefore, after a strong speech against the measure, moved an amendment to the address.

To assure his Majesty that his Majesty's kingdom of Ireland is inseparably united with Great Britain, and that the sentiments, wishes, and real interests of all his subjects are, that it should continue so united in the enjoyment of a free Constitution, in support of the honour and dignity of his Majesty's crown, and in the advancement of the welfare of the whole empire,—which blessings we owe to the spirited exertions of an independent resident Parliament, the paternal kindness of his Majesty, and the liberality of the British Parliament in 1782, and which we feel ourselves at all times, and particularly at the present moment, bound in duty to maintain.

Lord Castlereagh opposed this amendment;

said the question had been withdrawn last year because the people did not understand it, but now, he believed, a great majority did; that it should be submitted to the cool and dispassionate consideration of Parliament; that nineteen counties had come forward and petitioned in its favour. This is one of the first strides in the oratory of the noble lord, for which he made himself so conspicuous afterwards in the Imperial Parliament. Unmeaning phrases, broad and startling assertions (next morning discovered to be false), and interminable sentences. The real meaning of this speech was, that Government had lavished their bribes, and used their influence, rather authority, with such success, that by craft, force, and fraud, and even forgery,* they had got a number of signatures to petitions from various individuals, which they unjustly represented as expressing the sense of the several counties, the entire amount of which did not exceed 7000.

Mr. (afterwards Lord) Plunket reprobated the conduct of Government in the strongest manner, and delivered a most eloquent and argumentative speech. He said that—

"During the whole interval between the sessions, the most barefaced system of parliamentary corruption has been pursued—dismissals, promotions, threats, promises: in despite of all this, the minister feared he could not succeed in parliament, and he affected to appeal to what he had before despised,—the sentiment of the people. When he was confident of a majority, the people were to be heard only through the constitutional medium of their representatives: when he was driven out of parliament, the sense of the people became everything. Bribes were promised to the Catholic clergy; bribes were promised to the Presbyterian clergy: I trust they have been generally spurned with the contempt they merited. The noble lord under-

* Numbers of forged signatures were affixed to the petitions in favour of the Union; persons of the lower class; paupers, bankrupts, and beggars.—See Dublin Evening Post Newspaper.

derstands but badly the genius of the religion in which he was educated. You held out hopes to the Catholic body, which were never intended to be gratified, regardless of the disappointment, and indignation, and eventual rebellion which you might kindle,—regardless of everything, provided the present paltry little object were obtained. In the same breath you held out professions to the Protestant, equally delusive; and having thus prepared the way, the representative of Majesty set out on his mission, to court his Sovereign, the Majesty of the People. It is painful to dwell on that disgraceful exhibition,—no place too obscure to be visited—no rank too low to be courted—no threat too vile to be refrained from—the counties not sought to be legally convened by their sheriffs—no attempt to collect the unbiassed suffrage of the intelligent and independent part of the community—public addresses sought for from petty villages, and private signatures smuggled from public counties; and how procured? By the influence of absentee landlords; not over the affections, but over the terrors of their tenantry,—by griping agents and revenue officers. And after all this mummery had been exhausted—after the lustre of royalty had been tarnished by this vulgar intercourse with the lowest of the rabble—after every spot had been selected where a paltry address could be procured, and every place avoided where a manly sentiment could be encountered—after abusing the names of the dead, and forging the signatures of the living—after polling the inhabitant of the gaol, and calling out against the parliament the suffrages of those who dare not come in to sign them until they had got their protections in their pocket—after employing the revenue officer to threaten the publican that he should be marked as a victim, and the agent to terrify the shivering tenant with the prospect of his turf-bog being withheld if he did not sign your addresses—after employing your military commanders, the uncontrolled arbiters of life and death, to hunt the rabble against the constituted authorities—after squeezing the lowest dregs of a population of near five millions, you obtained about five thousand signatures, three-fourths of whom affixed their names in surprise, terror, or total ignorance of the subject; and after all this canvass of the people, and after all this corruption wasted on the parliament, and after all your boasting that you must carry the measure by a triumphant majority, you do not dare to announce the subject in the speech from the

throne. You talk of respect for our gracious Sovereign! I ask, what can be a more gross disrespect than this tampering with the royal name, pledged to the English parliament to bring the measure before us at a proper opportunity—holding it out to us at the close of the last session, and not daring to hint it at the beginning of this? Is it not notorious why you do not bring forward the measure now? Because the fruits of your corruption have not yet blossomed—because you did not dare to hazard a debate last session, in order to fill up the vacancies which the places bestowed by you, avowedly for this question, had occasioned—and because you have employed the interval in the same sordid traffic—and because you have a band of disinterested patriots waiting to come in and complete the enlightened majority who are to vote away the liberties of Ireland. Will you dare to act on a majority so obtained? Fatal will be your councils and disastrous your fate, if you resolve to do so. You have adopted the extremes of the despot and the revolutionist—you have invoked the loyal people and parliament of Ireland, who were not calling on you—you have assayed every means to corrupt that parliament, if you could, to sell their country—you have exhausted the whole patronage of the Crown in execution of that system—and to crown all, you openly avow, and it is notoriously a part of your plan, that the constitution of Ireland is to be purchased for a stipulated sum. I state a fact, for which, if untrue, I deserve serious reprehension; I state it as a fact, that you cannot dare to deny, that 15,000*l.* apiece is to be given to certain individuals as the price for their surrendering—What? Their property? No; but the rights of representation of the people of Ireland; and you will then proceed in this, or in an imperial parliament, to lay taxes on the wretched natives of this land to pay the purchase of their own slavery. It was in the last stage of vice and decrepitude that the Roman purple was set up for sale, and the sceptre of the world transferred for a stipulated price; but even then the horde of slaves who were to be ruled would not have endured that their country itself should have been enslaved to another nation. Do not persuade yourselves that a young, gallant, hardy, enthusiastic people like the Irish, are to be enslaved by means so vile, or will submit to injuries so palpable and galling. From those acts of despotism you plunge into the phrenzy of revolution, at a time when that political madness has

desolated the face of the world, when all establishment is staggering under the drunkenness of theory in this country, which, it is said, has been peculiarly visited by this pestilence—when even the projects which the noble lord may recollect to have been entertained by the Northern Whig Club have been necessarily suspended, if not abandoned—when you have found it necessary to enact temporary laws, taking away almost every one of the ordinary privileges of the subjects of a free constitution—with the trial by jury superseded, and the whole country subject to martial law—a law by which the liberty and life of every man rests merely on the security of military discretion—a law which you have not yet ventured to repeal, and the necessity of whose continuance is strongly hinted in the speech from the Throne—with a bloody rebellion only extinguished, and a formidable invasion only escaped—you call on this distracted country to uproot itself of its constitution; and having been refused by the wisdom and virtue of parliament, you desire the rabble of every description to array themselves against the constituted authorities, and to put down their parliament, because *they* would not put down the constitution.

Mr. Fitzgerald (late Prime-Sergeant)—

The genius, the ambition, and the aspiring thoughts of man are not to be controlled; and little reason have we, dressed in a little brief and questioned authority, to expect that the increasing population of four millions of people will respect this compact, if entered into, as sacred. It will be handed down to them with the history of the present day, and the means taken to effect this mighty change; they will be told that the country was called upon to the compact when martial law was in full force—they will hear of the years 1779 and 1782—they will inquire how they lost the great acquisitions of those days, a free residing and superintending legislature—they will inquire by what means they lost the power of granting supplies, the true source of national independence and the great constitutional control of the executive power, whether resident or non-resident; and I much fear that, dazzled by the splendour, without the loyalty and moderation, of 1782, similar claims may be made, and Great Britain may not be found in a similar disposition to concede. The parliament of Ireland is the best mediator between the Irish

nation and the parliament of Great Britain. They did not, by a rash adoption of popular opinion, commit the two countries; their prudence interposed delay, and produced the constitution which I trust will last for ever. Preserve, then, your parliament as the hostage of the constitution. *If the spirit of '82 should again arise, and Ireland should have no parliament to control her impatience, I tremble for the consequence.*

Mr. Arthur Moore—

Sir, we may feel the respect that is shown to privileges in the use that is made of the influence of the Crown, and the unbounded patronage of Ministers to overthrow them, in the promises that are made, in the places that are given, in the honours and promotions that are lavished—if it can be called honour and promotion which is acquired by such means—in the removal from office of able and honourable men, and in the substitution of men whose sole merit is their zeal for this degrading measure: can these, and the other innumerable practices made use of to obtain a majority in favour of the Union, be called by any milder epithets than those of bribery and corruption? But, sir, the means made use of to carry the Union are not confined to the parliament; the whole nation has been practised upon. How have the sheriffs been appointed? How have grand juries been in many places selected? How have addresses been procured? By what means have some counties been deceived and others refused the liberty of expressing their opinions in a constitutional manner? What has been the use which has been made of the martial law bill? Or will posterity, or even the contemporary people of Europe, believe that Ireland has been called upon to surrender her constitution while such a law was in force and acted upon,—a law, the principle of which is better calculated to stifle opinions than to repress crimes, and to promote rather than to correct the depravity of the times. But, sir, it was seen that while the parliament and the nation continued of the same opinion, there could be no hope of accomplishing the measure. What was to be done, then? There was a *factitious* sense of the people to be set up against the *real* sense of their representatives; and that parliament which, while it was supposed to be corrupt, was asserted to be omnipotent, as soon as it proved itself to be virtuous, was appealed from with a strong implication of its incompetence.

And to whom was the appeal made? To every man who could be bribed, seduced, intimidated, or punished. In how many instances was there an open, fair appeal made to the free, unbiassed sentiments of any body of people recognised by the law and constitution as having a right to assemble and declare their opinions upon public events? Well, the signatures, if not the sense of some thousands of people out of some millions, are procured in favour of the Union—with all the industry of Administration and its emissaries, they have been able to do no more—and how have the great majority of these been procured? By threats and menaces—by terror and false pretences—by forging of names—by spies, hirelings, and calumniators—by dividing the people, setting the landlord against his tenant, the soldier against the citizen, the pastor against his flock, the parent against his child, sect against sect, and principle against principle—by the agency of the placeman and expectant—by the influence of the purse and the sword, of the *civil magistrate* and the *military magistrate*—by promises never intended to be performed—and by promises which, if performed, would be the very perfection of political criminality. In this way has an attempt been made to poll the people against the sense of their representatives. Upon the foundation of these signatures, I presume, it is that the noble lord says, that the nation is for the Union; and upon such evidence is it that our most gracious Sovereign, and the English parliament and people, are induced to believe that the accomplishment of the measure is only retarded by a faction against the sense of the country. Would to God the whole British nation could have the testimony of their own eyes and ears, for the actual condition and sentiments of this country; they would see whether those who oppose, or those who support the Union, are the best friends to the constitution, the liberty, and the tranquillity even of their own country. Sir, there is one class of men who, I do not hesitate to say, have contributed even as much as Ministers to diffuse the fallacious opinion in England, that this country will be satisfied with a Union,—I mean the absentees; and acting upon that impression, we find their agents making the greatest efforts to obtain signatures in favour of it on their estates, and what have been the means in many instances practised on these estates? To refuse leases to those who have none; to threaten to call for the rent to the hour; to

hold the terrors of an ejectment over him who hesitates to sign, or, if he cannot write, to lend his name to resolutions calling for the surrender of that which is the security of his property—of his liberty—of his life. Sir, I have no hesitation to say, that if they carry the measure under all the circumstances which I have stated and observed upon, it will be a robbery, and not a treaty—an act of constraint and violence, not of compact and volition—a conquest, not a Union. Union upon such principles, and accomplished by such *means*, policy never can require—justice never can sanctify—wisdom never can approve—patriotism never can reconcile—time never can cement—and force never can establish. It might be a Union for a few days—a few months; perhaps for a few years; but it would be followed with ages of ill-blood, generations of hostility, centuries of contest and desolation, and misery to this island to all eternity; it would be a Union founded on the violation of public faith, erected on national degradation, equally subversive of the moral, physical, and political fitness of things, and equally odious and abominable in the sight of God and man.

Mr. George Ponsonby delivered an eloquent and able speech in support of the amendment, and thus terminated :—

If ever this House should consent to its own immolation—if ever the members of the Irish Commons should assent to an act for turning themselves out of doors—if this should ever happen, hope shall not quit me, until the last man shall have passed the door which the minister would close upon our liberties. When they shall approach that door, if they but cast a look behind, if they but view that chair where integrity now sits enthroned, if their eyes but linger on that floor where the flow of patriot eloquence has been poured forth for their country, if they but recollect all the struggles of honourable legislation which those walls have witnessed, they will stop before they have taken the last irretrievable step; they will cling to this House, the temple of their honour, and they would tell the minister, "Sir, you have taken an unjust advantage of our confidence, to desire us to destroy our country; you have taken a most ungenerous and unjust advantage of the state of that country to induce its Parliament to

annihilate itself and the liberties of its constituents; but we will show you that you have been mistaken in the calculation of our baseness; we will show you that we represent an honest, brave, and generous people, and are worthy to represent them; we will not flatter, but we will serve them, and establish an eternal claim to their gratitude, and to the gratitude of posterity." This, sir, I will suppose to be the influence of feeling, and the triumph of nature and of honour, should the negotiated sale of our liberties proceed to the last extremity, and until I shall see the last man out of these doors, and they shut upon him for ever, I will not believe that those who have lived with such honour, will die with such disgrace.

Mr. Charles Bushe, who for ten years afterwards was Solicitor-General, and twenty years Chief Justice, distinguished himself on this occasion:—

I strip this formidable measure of all its pretensions and all its aggravations; I look on it nakedly and abstractedly, and I see nothing in it but one question—will you give up the country? I forget for a moment the unprincipled means by which it has been promoted—I pass by for a moment the unseasonable time at which it has been introduced, and the contempt of Parliament upon which it is bottomed, and I look upon it, simply, as England reclaiming in a moment of your weakness, that dominion which you extorted from her in a moment of your virtue—a dominion which she uniformly abused, which invariably oppressed and impoverished you, and from the cessation of which *you date all your prosperity.* It is a measure which goes to degrade the country, by saying it is unfit to govern itself, and to stultify the Parliament by saying it is incapable of governing the country. It is the revival of that odious and absurd title of conquest; it is the renewal of the abominable distinction between mother-country and colony which lost America; it is the denial of the rights of nature to a great nation *from an intolerance of its prosperity.* * * *

You are called upon to give up your independence—and to whom are you called upon to give it up? To a nation which for six hundred years has treated you with uniform oppression and injustice. The treasury bench startles at the assertion—*non meus hic sermo est.* If the treasury

bench scold me, Mr. Pitt will scold *them*—it is his assertion in so many words in his speech. Ireland, says he, has been always treated with injustice and illiberality. Ireland, says Junius, has been uniformly plundered and oppressed. This is not the slander of Junius, nor the candour of Mr. Pitt—it is history. *For centuries has the British Parliament and nation kept you down, shackled your commerce and paralysed your exertions, despised your characters, and ridiculed your pretensions to any privileges, commercial or constitutional. She has never conceded a point to you which she could avoid, nor granted a favour which was not reluctantly distilled. They have been all wrung from her like drops of blood;* and you are not in possession of a single blessing (except those which you derived from God) that has not been either purchased or extorted by the virtue of your own Parliament from the illiberality of England.

Is the interval from the year 1779 to the year 1782 forgotten? How did you obtain your Mutiny Bill, your Octennial Bill, the repeal of Poyning's law, the independence of the judges, the restoration of your appellant jurisdiction, your free trade, and finally, your free constitution? * * * * *

Let me adjure the noble lord to weigh well and to consider deeply the probable permanency of a measure so conducted; let me implore him to avail himself of the passing experience of his own days, and of the instructions which history may afford him; and when he sees volcanic revolutions desolating the face of the political world, the first elementary principles of society loosening and dissolving, and empires not built upon the liberties of the people crumbling into dust; let him contemplate the awful change he is about to accomplish, and consider the dreadful responsibility he incurs to his Sovereign by exchanging the affections of a loyal nation for the reluctant obedience of a degraded and defrauded province; let him look for the permanency of this transaction something farther than to the vote of the night or the job of the morning, and let him have some better document than his army list for the affections of the people; let him consider whether posterity will validate this act, if they believe that the constitution of their ancestors was plundered by force or filched by artifice; let him, before it be too late, seriously ponder whether posterity will validate this act, if they

believe that the basest corruption and artifice were exerted to promote it, and that all the worst passions of the human heart were enlisted into the service, and all the most depraved ingenuity of the human intellect tortured to devise new contrivances of fraud. I do not say these things have been, I state hypothetically, and ask if posterity believe such things, will they validate the transaction? if they believe that there was foul play from the first moment to the last both within doors and without, that the rabble were appealed to from the Parliament, and debauched or intimidated to petition against the constitution of their country; if they believe that in Parliament the disgust of the measure, notwithstanding a proscription which made office incompatible with honour, stained the treasury bench—that the disgust of the measure broke asunder and dissolved some of the tenderest and most delicate connections of human life—that the nominal office of Escheator of Munster became an office of honourable competition, and after the Parliament was thus reduced that the Irish Commons were recruited from the English staff; if they were to believe those things, and that human frailty and human necessities were so practised upon that the private sentiments and public conduct of several could not be reconciled, and that where the minister could influence twenty votes he could not command one *hear him.*

I say not that these things are so; but I ask, if your posterity believe them to be so, will posterity validate this transaction, or will they feel themselves bound to do so? I answer; where a transaction, though fortified by sevenfold form, is radically fraudulent, that all the forms and solemnities of law are but so many badges of the fraud, and that posterity, like a great court of conscience, will pronounce its judgment.

At seven o'clock in the morning Mr. Egan had risen to speak, when Mr. Grattan entered the House. He was so debilitated that he was scarcely able to walk, and was supported by W. B. Ponsonby and Mr. Arthur Moore. The scene that took place was interesting in the extreme, and highly characteristic of the individual; novel to the House, and quite unexpected by

the Ministers, who were not aware that the election had taken place, or that the writ could be returned so soon. They were much surprised at his entrance, and more so at his appearance. The House and the galleries were seized with breathless emotion; and a thrilling sensation, a low murmur, pervaded the whole assembly, when they beheld a thin, weak, and emaciated figure, worn down by sickness of mind and body, scarcely able to sustain himself; the man who had been the founder of Ireland's independence in 1782 was now coming forward, feeble, helpless, and apparently almost in his last moments, to defend or to fall with his country.

His friends crowded round him, anxious to assist him,—Bowes Daly, in particular: seeing that Mr. Grattan had on his hat, he told him it was contrary to the rules of the House. Mr. Grattan calmly replied, "*Do not mind me, I know what to do.*" He was dressed in the Volunteer uniform—blue, with red cuffs and collar. He had placed his cocked hat square to the front, and kept it on till he advanced half-way up the floor; he then stopped and looked round the House with a steady and fearless eye, as if he wished to let them know that, though exhausted, he was yet prepared to give battle, and to bid them defiance; as an old soldier, he was resolved to show front, and let his opponents see that he was not to be trifled with. He knew that he would be pressed, and very soon attacked; and he thought it best to come forward at the outset. When he approached near the table, he then took off his hat; and the oaths having been administered (for by the rules of the Irish Parliament they could be taken at any time), he took his seat on the second bench, beside Mr. Plunket.

After Mr. Egan had finished, he rose, but

obtained leave to speak sitting; and to the astonishment of every one, he delivered an admirable speech for upwards of two hours, in which he went through the whole of the question. Mr. Corry replied, and commenced the meditated attack. He pressed Mr. Grattan severely, and alluded to his address to the citizens of Dublin in 1797. Mr. Grattan strove to say a few words in explanation, but his weakness, as well as the rules of the House, prevented him going further. On a division, the numbers were—for the amendment, 96; against it, 138; being a majority of 42* against Sir Lawrence Parsons.

A few extracts from Mr. Grattan's speech may here be given :—

The Minister sees—I do not—British merchants and British capital sailing to the provinces of Connaught and Munster; there they settle in great multitudes, themselves and families. He mentions not what descriptions of manufactures; who from Birmingham, who from Manchester. No matter; he cares not; he goes on asserting and asserting with great ease to himself, and without any obligation to fact. Imagination is the region he delights to disport; where he is to take away your Parliament —where he is to take away your final Judicature—where he is to take away your money—where he is to increase your taxes—where he is to get an Irish tribute. There he is a plain direct matter-of-fact man; but where he is to pay you for all this, there he is poetic and prophetic—no longer a financier, but an inspired accountant. Fancy gives him her wand. Amalthæa takes him by the hand; Ceres is in her train. * * * *

What he cannot reconcile to your interest he affects to reconcile to your honour. He, the Minister, "his budget with corruption crammed," proposes to you to give up the ancient inheritance of your country; to proclaim an utter and blank incapacity, and to register this proclamation of incapacity in an act which inflicts on this ancient nation

* The members for Clogher were unseated on petition, and Mr. King and Charles Ball, two anti-Unionists were returned, so that the real majority was but thirty-nine.

an eternal disability; and he accompanies these monstrous proposals by undisguised terror and unqualified bribery; and this he calls no attack on the honour and dignity of the kingdom! * * * *

The thing he proposes to buy is what cannot be sold—liberty! For it, he has nothing to give. Everything of value which you possess you obtained under a free constitution. Part with it, and you must be not only a slave but an idiot. * * * *

His propositions not only go to your dishonour, but they are built upon nothing else. He tells you it is his main argument, that you are unfit to exercise a free constitution; and he affects to prove it by the experiment. "Jacobinism grows," says he, "out of the very state and condition of Ireland." I have heard of Parliament impeaching Ministers, but here is a Minister impeaching Parliament. He does more: he impeaches the Parliamentary constitution itself. The abuses in that constitution he has protected; it is only its being that he destroys. On what ground? Your exports since your emancipation, and under that Parliamentary constitution, and in a great measure by that Parliamentary constitution, have nearly doubled. Commercially it has worked well. Your concord with England since the Emancipation, as far as it relates to Parliament, on the subject of war, has been not only approved, but has been productive. Imperially, therefore, it has worked well. What then does the Minister in fact object to? That you have supported him—that you have concurred in his system; therefore he proposes to the people to abolish the Parliament, and to continue the Minister. He does more: he proposes to you to substitute the British Parliament in your place; to destroy the body that restored your liberties, and restore that body which destroyed them. Against such a proposition, were I expiring on the floor, I should beg to utter my last breath and record my dying testimony.

The violent and arbitrary disposition of Government soon found an opportunity to gratify itself after the debate on the address. A trifling riot occurred in the streets, and some of the Union members were insulted on their return from the House. This was immediately seized upon as a

ground for interfering. Mr. St. George Daly, the new Prime Sergeant, in order to qualify himself for the office from which Mr. Fitzgerald had been expelled, and to repay the Government for the services rendered to him, came prominently forward, inveighed against the people as guilty of the grossest outrage, and demanded that witnesses should be summoned to the bar to answer for their breach of privilege. This was acceded to; and the House in a very summary manner sent to gaol a very respectable citizen, an officer in the Customs, and a member of a Yeomanry Corps, under the charge of having committed a riot, though it was deposed to in evidence that this individual had been struck, and had only retaliated on his assailant, and that the Town-major (Swan) had *fired* his pistol at him, and arrested him; thus the real sufferer was sent to Newgate, and the individual who fired was not even censured. The Government were not slow to act, and they quickly availed themselves of this occurrence for the purpose of introducing a military force; and under the pretence of protecting the freedom of debate and the persons of the members, they took possession of a large wooden building at Foster Place, adjoining the House of Commons, which was used as an exhibition room; this was converted into a temporary barrack, and a body of troops (an English regiment) was stationed there —in fact to overawe the Parliament—under pretence of protecting the members.

Lord Castlereagh lost no time in following up his successes on the first day, and proposed a measure most efficient for his purpose, namely, to remove from the kingdom the Irish who bore arms; and accordingly he proposed, on the 21st of January, that 10,000 *Volunteers* from the Irish militia should be allowed to serve his Majesty

in the army in Europe, at a bounty of six and ten guineas per man. This crafty plan was followed by another, namely, the substitution of English militia in their stead. Thus he removed the Irish, who might on an emergency have evinced some feeling for their country, and he introduced English troops, who could not but feel very differently, and at any critical moment would be sure to take part with the Government against the people.

Shortly after this another event occurred which called forth a similar demonstration on the part of the Government, and showed how little respect they paid to the rights of the people, or to the privileges of Parliament, though a few days before they professed to be so eager to uphold them.

On the 12th of February a complaint was made to the House of Commons, by Sir L. Parsons, that the High Sheriff of the King's County (Mr. Darby), and the officer in command of the British Artillery at Birr (Major Rogers), had interfered to intimidate and disperse a meeting of the freeholders of the county, who had assembled to petition against the Union. Major Rogers was accordingly summoned and examined at the bar. He stated that he had his artillery and his troops ready, and that he only waited for one word from the Sheriff to blow the house where the freeholders were about their ears. The Sheriff also admitted that it was his intention to disperse the meeting. Notwithstanding these declarations, the House, under dictation from the Minister, resolved that such conduct was not intended to interfere with the right of petition; and the parties were allowed to retire in triumph from the presence of the assembly, which they had thus derided and insulted.*

* The above appears so singular that the account is here given:—

Major Rogers was afterwards appointed to a military situation, no doubt as a reward for his services; in the same manner as the informer Reynolds was appointed to an office in the Pen-

Sir L. Parsons called the attention of the house to a motion he had made on a former night, touching the proceedings adopted by the high sheriff of the King's County, and Major Rogers commanding the British artillery there, to intimidate the magistrates and freeholders from meeting at Birr, to petition Parliament against the adoption of the measure of a Legislative Union. He said, that he had already so fully expressed his sentiments on the fatal consequences that must result from such arbitrary proceedings being suffered to take place, that he should not at this time trespass on the attention of the house, but should merely move that these gentlemen do forthwith attend at the bar. He trusted that this business would meet with a cool and dispassionate investigation, it was one which involved the privilege of Parliament and the liberty of the subject. He said he had one or two witnesses to examine, and requested that Thomas Bernard, Esq., be called.

Mr. Bernard, sen., a magistrate and freeholder of the King's County, being called, deposed, that the meeting at Birr was convened by magistrates, the sheriff having refused to accede to the requisition of the freeholders. On the Sunday prior to the meeting, Major Rogers, of the Royal British Artillery, was at his (Mr. B.'s) house, and informed him *no such meeting should take place, and if attempted he would disperse it by military force.* Mr. B. told him he had better do nothing rashly—produced a number of papers relative to a Legislative Union, and among them several copies of the requisition for calling the county, one of which he gave Major Rogers for the purpose of forwarding it to government—no other conversation took place between them previous to the meeting. On the morning of Sunday, before the meeting took place, he had a conversation with the sheriff, who told him that the meeting was *not a legal one, and should not take place;* that the Session-House was his, and they had no right to meet there; Mr. B. answered, that the Session-House was the property of the magistrates, and that they had as good a right to meet there as he had. The innkeeper of the town also told him, *that the sheriff forbid him at his peril,* to suffer the meeting at his house. The meeting took place at two o'clock; the sheriff came to the Session-House, said he considered it an illegal meeting, that the house was his, and they had no right to remain there, and desired them to disperse; some of the magistrates made answer that the house was theirs, the meeting was a legal one, and they would not be dispersed but at the point of the bayonet; the sheriff replied, there sha'n't be any meeting, and so turned away; as he returned, the crowd pressed a little upon him, and he desired them to make way. Mr. Malone, a magistrate, told them to remain where they were, they had a right to do so. Mr. Bernard called out to them to give way to the sheriff, when he made answer, the sheriff can make way for himself, and so retired. Mr. Lloyd, the chairman, now read the petition, put the question on it, and it was unanimously adopted. A trifling difference of opinion afterwards prevailed, whether they should stay there to sign and await the soldiery, which they were assured were coming down to disperse them,

insula, when the Duke of Wellington was in command there.

On the 5th February, Lord Castlereagh delivered to the House a message from the Lord-Lieutenant recommending the Union. This was vigorously opposed by the opposition, and chiefly by Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Grattan, Sir John Parnell, and Mr. Ogle, who declared that he was adverse to it because it confessedly led to Catholic Emancipation and Reform.

or adjourn to another place; the latter opinion appeared most prevalent, and they retired to a public inn about sixty yards from the Session-House, where the petition lay on the table for signatures.

Deponent Mr. B. was the second who signed, and went out for the purpose of making room for the other freeholders. He walked towards the Session-House with M. Malone, and when he got a small distance from the public inn, he met *Major Rogers riding at the head of four pieces of artillery with matches, whether lighted or not he could not tell,* he was going towards the place where the meeting was. On one side of the street a number of *artillery men* marched with *small arms and fixed bayonets,* on the other a party of *Scotch Fencibles* in a similar manner. When at a small distance from Major Rogers, Mr. B. asked him, "Good God, what is all this?" "'T is what you must always expect," said Major R., "*while things do not go on square.*"

At this time the troops had passed the Session-House, and were advancing towards the inn where the petition lay for signatures; they proceeded to a small square in the town, where Major Rogers drew them up. On Major R.'s return, Mr. B. met him, and he informed Mr. B. *that he only waited for the sheriff's order, to blow down the house to the foundation.* The Tuesday after the meeting, Mr. B. met Major R., who said, "if he had received on Sunday, the letter which reached him on Monday, there would have been a pretty business;" and added, "that it was very strange the gentlemen at the Castle or Park did not know that a letter would be three days going from Dublin to Birr."

M. Bernard, on his cross-examination, declared, that he did not think the crowd assembled at Birr consisted of any others than freeholders of the county, to the best of his judgment; that his reasons for supposing Major Rogers's intention to disperse the meeting was, that he never saw him parade with cannon on a Sunday before, and his having told him previous to the meeting that he would disperse it by military force; he could not suppose Major Rogers jested when he said he would blow down the house about the ears of the freeholders, either from his countenance or tone of voice. The meeting was he said very numerous, but no appearance whatever of riot or disorder. He could not, he said, suppose the soldiers were going to parade, as they did not usually parade at that hour.

Mr. Lloyd, a magistrate of the King's County, chairman of the meeting, and many years representative of the county, gave very nearly the same testimony as Mr. B.

Mr. Grattan thus ended his speech on this day :—

It follows that the two nations are not identified, though the Irish Legislature be absorbed, and by that act of absorption the feelings of one of the nations is not identified but alienated. The petitions on our table bespeak that alienation; the Administration must by this time be acquainted with it; they must know that Union is Irish alienation, and knowing that they must be convinced that they had the authority of the minister's argument against the minister's project, I am not surprised that this project of Union should alienate the Irish; they consider it as a blow. Two honourable gentlemen, with an ardour which does them honour*—ingenuous young men—they have spoken with unsophisticated feeling, and the native honesty of good sense. The question is not such as occupied you of old, not old Poyning's, not peculation, not plunder, not an embargo, not a Catholic Bill, not a Reform Bill; it is your being, it is more—it is your life to come. Whether you will go, with the Castle at your head, to the tomb of Charlemont and the Volunteers, and erase his epitaph, or whether your children shall go to your graves saying a venal military court attacked the liberties of the Irish, and here lie the bones of the honourable dead men who saved their country! Such an epitaph is an epitaph which the King cannot give his slaves; it is a glory which the crown cannot give the King.

The speeches of Mr. Saurin and Mr. Ponsonby were said to have been excellent, particularly that of the former. The motion was supported by Mr. St. George Daly, who was supposed to have made, during the entire of these debates, the best speech of any in favour of the measure.

Mr. Corry replied to Mr. Grattan, and attacked him again at a time when he had no opportunity of replying. The debate was conducted with great spirit, and lasted till twelve o'clock in the ensuing day, when the numbers were—160 for

* Mr. O'Donnell and Colonel Vereker.

the proposition, and 117 against it, giving Government a majority of 43* in its favour,—thus only one was added to the majority on the first night of the session. On the 11th of February, a complaint was made to the House by Mr. (Sir Jonah) Barrington, that Sir Chas. Asgill, the officer commanding at Clonmel, had prevented the people from assembling to petition against the Union. His conduct was defended by the Attorney-General (Toler) by saying that *the officer had considered it dangerous to let the people assemble in a proclaimed district*, but the burgesses of the town could meet if they thought fit. The House declined to interfere, and permitted their privileges to be invaded, and the rights of the subject to be thus openly violated and superseded by military power.

The course which the minister now took was to press forward the question with the utmost speed, and on the 14th he moved the order of the day to go into a committee on the subject. The opposition in vain remonstrated, and proposed that on the part of the country more time should be allowed in order that the people might consider the question more deliberately, and that the House might examine the correctness of the statements submitted to them, and ascertain the calculations made by the Government respecting the trade and commerce of the country, and how far they would be affected by the proposed Union. This was refused, and Mr. W. B. Ponsonby then proposed an amendment, upon which the numbers were only 89 to 126 against it. Colonel Barry (Lord Farnham) moved that they should adjourn for a few days, and for this the *ayes* were 110 and the *noes* 157. A committee was appointed

* The real majority was but thirty-nine, as two anti-Unionists were seated on petition, and two Unionists were unseated.

to examine witnesses as to the trade and manufactures of the country, Mr. Pim, Mr. Orr, and several other merchants and manufacturers, gave very important evidence, and their opinion was, that the trade and manufactures of Ireland would sink under the Union. Mr. Orr stated, that prior to 1796 he had employed in his establishment upwards of 3,000 persons in working muslins and cottons, that he would not be able to employ so many in future, hence the trade would be greatly injured by the proposed measures, and that the manufacturers could not hold out against the competition with England.*. Other evidence of a similar nature was given, when Lord Castlereagh, fearing that this would not be serviceable to his cause, declared himself averse to further delay, as conflicting evidence would be adduced, therefore he sought to hasten the business. Mr. Wolfe (Lord Kilwarden) differed from him on this subject, much to his credit, as he was connected with the Government. However, it was useless; Lord Castlereagh prevailed.

On Friday the 17th of February, the articles of Union were considered. The House was in Committee, and Mr. Foster (the Speaker) went at considerable length into the subject, and made a very able statement of the trade and revenue of the country. He spoke for upwards of two

* This has been verified by the event; Irish manufactures have been completely swamped—and the trades in Dublin as well as in other parts of Ireland are reduced to nothing—where thousands and hundreds of persons were formerly employed, few, if any, are now at work; this not only in Dublin, but in all the other towns where trade flourished; leather trade, glass trade, linen trade, cotton trade, all fell victims to this measure.—See the Railway Report and Evidence.

It is to be observed that in 1785, when the British manufacturers formed their committee in England, at the period of the Irish propositions, that the evidence then given stated that if the Irish continued their exertions, they would rival the British, and meet them with success in the foreign market, as a remedy to which they asked for a Union—and the decay of Ireland followed.

hours on these points, and showed the advantages Ireland had gained, and the great progress she had made since 1782, and gave it as his opinion that a Union would prove injurious to her. He made an earnest appeal to the House, and concluded by saying, "*I declare from my soul, that if England were to give us all her revenues, I could not barter for them the free constitution of my country.*"

Mr. Corry had been selected to defend the first articles; but he did not rest satisfied by merely discharging this duty. Unfortunately he owed another debt to the minister. His lot was to renew the personal attack upon Mr. Grattan, and for the third time he assailed him; but on this occasion his opponent had the privilege to reply. Mr. Grattan came into the house as Mr. Corry was reading the address of 1797 to the citizens of Dublin, and commenting on it very severely. He took his seat by Foster, and, turning to him, exclaimed, "*I see they wish to make an attack on my life, and the sooner the better.*" When Mr. Corry had ended, Mr. Grattan replied in a speech that astonished and electrified the House. Since his reply to Flood in '83, nothing of that character had been heard in Parliament. He was here on trial after an ordeal of two years, during which Government had attacked him with all the bitterness they possessed. Full of rancour and malignity, they had forged something in the shape of a report from the Secret Committee, which was a calumnious and notorious falsehood. Every species of abuse and calumny, vituperation, proscription, and persecution, had been unsparingly heaped upon him. He stood before his enemies, he confronted and bade them defiance; but he confounded, and almost appalled them. He stood in the hall of his ancient glories, and those of his country, amidst the dying embers of her freedom,

and strove to snatch from the sacred pile a brand that could light her to resurrection.

Æstuat ingens
Imo in corde pudor mistoque insania luctu
Et furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.

His answer was not confined to Mr. Corry. He arraigned the Government; he told them they were in a conspiracy against the country; that they were corrupt and seditious; selling themselves and selling the constitution; that two parties had been in arms against her; that he would join neither; that the rebel who rose against the King deserved to die, but that he missed on the scaffold the right honourable gentleman.

Mr. Bushe, who heard it, said he never witnessed such a scene. The minister was electrified. Never was such a castigation given to any party. Sir Robert Walpole's attack on the Jacobites comes nearer to it than any. When Mr. Grattan had ended, he left the house, and, passing by where Mr. Plunket sat, took him by the hand, and pressed him with a strength that satisfied him that all was right, and, as Mr. Plunket used afterwards to say, when alluding to those times, "*That affair was more conducive to his health than the medicine of all his doctors.*" The following was the substance of Mr. Grattan's reply:—

Has the gentleman done? Has he completely done? He was unparliamentary from the beginning to the end of his speech. There was scarce a word he uttered that was not a violation of the privileges of the House; but I did not call him to order—why? because the limited talents of some men render it impossible for them to be severe without being unparliamentary. But before I sit down I shall show him how to be severe and parliamentary at the same time. On any other occasion I should think myself justifiable in treating with silent contempt anything which might fall from that honourable member; but there

are times when the insignificance of the accuser is lost in the magnitude of the accusation. I know the difficulty the honourable gentleman laboured under when he attacked me, conscious that, on a comparative view of our characters, public and private, there is nothing he could say could injure me. The public would not believe the charge. I despise the falsehood. If such a charge were made by an honest man, I would answer it in the manner I shall do before I sit down. But I shall first reply to it, when not made by an honest man.

The right honourable gentleman has called me "an unimpeached traitor." I ask, why not *traitor*, unqualified by any epithet? I will tell him—it was because he dare not. It was the act of a coward, who has raised his arm to strike, but has not courage to give the blow. I will not call him *villain*, because it would be unparliamentary, and he is a privy councillor. I will not call him *fool*, because he happens to be Chancellor of the Exchequer; but I say he is one who has abused the privilege of Parliament and freedom of debate, to the uttering language which, if spoken out of the House, I should answer only with a blow. I care not how high his situation, how low his character, how contemptible his speech, whether a privy counsellor or a parasite, my answer would be—a blow. He has charged me with being connected with the rebels. The charge is utterly, totally, and meanly false. Does the honourable gentleman rely on the report of the House of Lords for the foundation of his assertion? If he does, I can prove to the Committee there was a physical impossibility of that report being true; but I scorn to answer any man for my conduct, whether he be a political coxcomb, or whether he brought himself into power by a false glare of courage or not. I scorn to answer any wizard of the Castle throwing himself into fantastic airs; but if an honourable and independent man were to make a charge against me I would say, "You charge me with having an intercourse with rebels, and you found your charge upon what is said to have appeared before a Committee of the Lords. Sir, the report of that Committee is totally and egregiously irregular." I will read a letter from Mr. Neilson, who had been examined before that Commitee. It states, that what that report represents him as having spoken *is not what he said.* [Mr. Grattan here read the letter from Mr. Neilson, denying that he

had any connection with Mr. Grattan, as charged in the report, and concluding by saying, "*Never was misrepresentation more vile than that put into my mouth by the report.*"]

From the situation I held, and from the connection I had in the city of Dublin, it was necessary for me to hold intercourse with various descriptions of persons The right honourable member might as well have been charged with a participation in the guilt of those traitors, for he had communicated with some of those very persons on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. The Irish Government, too, were in communication with some of them.

The right honourable member has told me I deserted a profession where wealth and station were the reward of industry and talent. If I mistake not, that gentleman endeavoured to obtain those rewards by the same means, but he soon deserted the occupation of a barrister for those of a parasite and pander. He fled from the labour of study to flatter at the table of the great. He found the Lords' parlour a better sphere for his exertions than the hall of the four Courts, the house of a great man a more convenient way to power and to place, and that it was easier for a statesman of middling talents to sell his friends than a lawyer of no talents to sell his clients.

For myself, whatever corporate or other bodies have said or done to me, I from the bottom of my heart forgive them. I feel I have done too much for my country to be vexed at them. I would rather that they should not feel or acknowledge what I have done for them and call me traitor, than have reason to say I sold them. I will always defend myself against the assassin; but with large bodies it is different. To the people I will bow: they may be my enemy; I never shall be theirs.

At the emancipation of Ireland in 1782 I took a leading part in the formation of that constitution, which is now endeavoured to be destroyed. Of that constitution I was the author; in that constitution I glory; and for it the honourable gentleman should bestow praise, not invent calumny. Notwithstanding my weak state of body, I come to give my last testimony against this Union, so fatal to the liberties and interest of my country. I come to make common cause with these honourable and virtuous gentlemen around me; to try and save the constitution;

or, if not save the constitution, at least to save our characters, and remove from our graves the foul disgrace of standing apart while a deadly blow is aimed at the independence of our country.

The right honourable gentleman says I fled from the country after exciting rebellion, and that I have returned to raise another. No such thing. The charge is false. The civil war had not commenced when I left the kingdom, and I could not have returned without taking a part. On the one side there was the camp of the rebel, on the other the camp of the minister, a greater traitor than that rebel. The stronghold of the constitution was nowhere to be found. I agree that the rebel who rises against the Government should have suffered; but I missed on the scaffold the right honourable gentleman. Two desperate parties were in arms against the constitution. The right honourable gentleman belonged to one of these parties and deserved death. I could not join the rebel—I could not join the Government—I could not join torture—I could not join half-hanging—I could not join free quarter—I could take part with neither. I was therefore absent from a scene where I could not be active without self-reproach, nor indifferent with safety.

Many honourable gentlemen thought differently from me. I respect their opinions, but I keep my own; and I think now, as I thought then, *that the treason of the Minister against the liberties of the people was infinitely worse than the rebellion of the people against the Minister.*

I have returned, not, as the right honourable member has said, to raise another storm; I have returned to discharge an honourable debt of gratitude to my country that conferred a great reward for past services, which, I am proud to say, was not greater than my desert. I have returned to protect that constitution of which I was the parent and the founder from the assassination of such men as the right honourable gentleman and his unworthy associates. They are corrupt, they are seditious, and they, at this very moment, are in a conspiracy against their country. I have returned to refute a libel, as false as it is malicious, given to the public under the appellation of a Report of the Committee of the Lords. Here I stand ready for impeachment or trial. I dare accusation. I defy the honourable gentleman. I defy the Government. I defy their whole phalanx; let them come forth. I tell

the Ministers I will neither give them quarter nor take it. I am here to lay the shattered remains of my constitution on the floor of this House in defence of the liberties of my country.

Many persons were surprised that the Chairman of the Committee did not interfere. It was thought that Mr. (Lord) Hutchinson would have called on him to do so, for after Mr. Grattan had concluded he got up and begged to call the attention of the Chairman to the proceedings before the Committee; but, instead of alluding to the altercation they had just witnessed, he at once diverged, and gravely observed that the question was divisible into three distinct heads, and that he would proceed calmly to analyze them; in the mean time the parties left the House and thus escaped from arrest. Sir John Parnell now moved that the Chairman should leave the chair, and in this he was supported by Mr. Dawson, Mr. Egan, Mr. Peter Burrowes, George Ponsonby, and Mr. Goold, and opposed by Mr. Smith, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Francis Hutchinson, Dr. Browne, and Mr. Martin, who attacked Mr. Goold very severely; on a division the numbers were—against the Government, 140; for them, 161.

Some remarks may now be made upon the principal actor in this drama.—Mr. Isaac Corry, who had been so unworthily employed to take such a part on the occasion, was member for the borough of Newry; he was unquestionably a man of talent, and not without just pretensions. In early life he began with the people, though he ended against them; and, like most renegades,* who never do things by halves, ran violently into the other extreme. He was bribed by the court,

* Sir Francis Burdett is a deplorable instance. When he thought fit to change to Toryism, he was particularly hostile to the people and to the Irish, whom he abused much more than he had ever praised them.

and his wants compelled him to sell the country. In early life he had been in habits of close acquaintance with Mr. Grattan, not merely as a friend but an admirer. He was first a guest at Tinnehinch, then a frequent visitor, at last an enthusiast, and in the complimentary verses * which he there wrote he has left a record of his esteem and his admiration. The course which he pursued affords a melancholy instance of the danger that follows from the corruption of a court. How fatally a generous spirit can be perverted by the arts of politicians; seduced by the lures of office, and finally ruined by the enticements of a cunning cold-blooded Minister, who was not satisfied that his satellites should betray their country unless they put to death her defenders.

Mr. Corry may have thought he had an excuse for selling Ireland because he possessed no stake in her; he was a person of no property, over-placed and over-salaried. As a speaker he was short, pointed, and neat, and what he said he delivered with elegance and with address; his

* The following are the lines written by Mr. Corry in the parlour facing Sugar-Loaf Hill.

Tinnehinch, 28th April, 1794.

Behold that mountain tow'ring rugged high
That culminating, daring, braves the sky,
Planted on broad and solid rocky base,
Impregnable in strength assumes its place,
Look then upon the placid verdant green,
That here adorns the calm domestic scene,
Gay, soft, luxuriant, decked with every flower
That can amuse the careless saunt'ring hour
In these extremes, the genuine type you'll find,
Of Grattan's tow'ring, Grattan's playful mind;
Behold that stream, now down the mountain side
Roll in impetuous course its foaming tide,
Soon as the placid vale it reaches here,
In gentlest lapse, delight the eye, the ear,
Thus sympathising Harriet, born to please,
Shows Grattan's greatness, or adorns his ease;
Live, happy pair, example bright to give,
How genius, talents, reason, virtue live.

Signed I. C.

manner was graceful, and was better than his matter; his person was pleasing, and his voice clear and harmonious; his invectives were good, and he possessed much spirit; in personality he was better than in argument; he was a brave man, but a bad reasoner; and always ready to back what he said with his sword.

In the Imperial Parliament Mr. Pitt continued him for some time in the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland; but in that assembly his style was altered, his tones lowered, and all his lofty periods and airs of office vanished; he began cringing and creeping, with supple knee and submissive voice, "*begging pardon of the House for taking up their time with Irish affairs*" (these were his words). When he was removed, Mr. Foster succeeded him; and the conduct of the latter, compared to that of the former, was excellent: Foster's was that of a country gentleman—Corry's that of an upstart. The life and death of this individual is a great lesson to Irishmen. The ministers made him their tool, and left him their victim. They led him to take a bold, but a very bad part, and urged him on to deeds from which human nature should recoil. At first they found him an adventurer,—young and aspiring, then they exalted him; afterwards they neglected him, and at last left him, to die unregarded, unnoticed, and almost unknown.*

It cannot be doubted that the attack on Mr.

* In 1810 he was at Brighton, where Mr. Grattan resided; he looked broken in spirits, quite downcast in looks and manner, and seemed to shun all observation; he called on Mr. Grattan, and having been perceived approaching the house, no one would admit him. The ladies of the family, who were in spirit and principle purely Irish, were particularly hostile. Mr. Grattan insisted on going down stairs, he opened the door himself, and took Corry by the hand, the latter felt gratified and seemed greatly affected; it was their last interview—he did not live long after it. Even this act of kindness crowned the cup of affliction to overflow—*the wound he felt had gone through his heart!*—and like other Unionists, Clare, Brown, Smith, Johnson, Hutchinson, Donoughmore, &c., he died bitterly regretting the part he had taken against his country.

Grattan was premeditated and deliberate. Mr. Berwick, who had known Corry long before, met him at Harrowgate, in 1799, and found that he was then collecting all the materials he could get against him. Berwick, who was well acquainted with the politics of that period, attended the debates of the Union, heard Corry speak, and said that it was he who began the attack, and pressed Mr. Grattan from the outset; the latter declined the contest, as they had been old friends; but Corry renewed the attack on every occasion, so much so that Mr. Grattan could not avoid to reply, and in the committee he had the opportunity. Berwick's opinion was, that he had been set on by the Government; for they knew that if Mr. Grattan had been disposed of, the others would soon have given way: other persons, and good authorities, concurred in this opinion of Mr. Berwick. Dean Scott (nephew to Lord Clonmell, Chief Justice), Mr. Francis Hardy, Mr. Jas. Jonas Corry, Clerk of Parliament, and personal friend of the Speaker, Mr. Ross M'Can (Secretary to the Whig Club), and Mr. H. Bushe, who held office under that Government, and who knew the actors in all the transactions of those times; these, and many others, have repeatedly stated, that the plan of personal combat proceeded from the Government party, and had been arranged at the Castle.

The account that Mr. Grattan gave of the transaction was pretty nearly as follows:—

On the first night that I took my seat Corry spoke, and alluded to me, though not in very severe terms, but still a denunciation of hostility. I said something in reply, but short, as by the rules of the House I was not allowed to do so at any length, and I was too ill. He attacked me afterwards in the Committee. I came into the House when he had my address to the citizens of Dublin in his

hand, from which he read some passages, and commented upon them. After he sat down I replied, and was somewhat severe. Corry then got up to answer me. His speech was a challenge; it was not small artillery, but a twenty-four pounder. Then I got up, and had no mercy on him. I was very severe, and said the hardest things; not coarse, nor departing from the language of a gentleman, for I knew his character too well to be at a loss. After this I spoke in my defence, and told him that there was, in my opinion, a greater crime than that of high treason to the king—that was, treason to the country. There were traitors in the rebel camp; there were traitors also in the Government, and both wanted to destroy the country. I could not join the one,—I would not join the other. There were men among the Government who supported it, perhaps, from good motives; but if any man out of this House said I was a traitor, I would answer him by a blow! I told him I had heard before of the plan to support the Union by personal combat. When I had finished I left the House. Bowes Daly said to me, "Go out of the House immediately, or something may occur to prevent you." I remained in the speaker's chamber, and about the House till daylight. James Blackwood (Lord Dufferin) offered to be my second; but I had told Hutchinson (Lord Hutchinson) to procure a second, and he got my friend Metge—a very good one, who brought my pistols to me, as I feared to go home lest I should be arrested. General Craddock came with a challenge, but hoped for an accommodation. I replied, impossible. We went to Ball's bridge: on the ground the people cheered me. I had my pistol in one hand, and my hat in the other. The sheriffs approached.* We ran from thence, and when ordered we both fired. I hit Corry; he missed me: we were then ordered to fire a second time, but at the signal we reserved our shots: the seconds then made us give our honour to fire; we did so. I do not know whether Corry fired at me the second time.

* General Craddock (Lord Howden), who was Mr. Corry's second, told Admiral Blackwood (a relation of Mrs. Grattan's) that when the sheriff came to the field he forced him into a ditch, where he was kept until the parties had fired, so bent were the Castle party on going through with the business. A few days after the duel, Mr. Grattan called on Corry and insisted on seeing him; he got into his room where he was in bed, and a third person came in as Mr. Grattan was inquiring after his health; Corry said, "here is my brother Edward; Edward, here is Mr. Grattan, and he will shoot you *whenever you deserve it.*"

I fired above him. I did not take aim at him the first shot. I could have killed him if I chose, but I fired along the line. I had no enmity to him. I had gotten a victory, and knew it could not be more complete if he was killed, and that it would if I did not fire at him. It was, however, dangerous not to do so, for he might have killed me, but I thought it would be better to run the risk, and fire in the air. I then went up to him; he was bleeding. He gave me his bloody hand: we had formerly been friends, but Corry was set on to do what he did: a plan had been formed to make personal attacks on the opposition, and their men had been singled out. I did not publish the attack I had made upon him, as it had been settled by a duel, but I sent my defence.

CHAPTER IV.

Effect of the duel between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Corry on the supportors of the Union.—Case of bribery, 5,000 guineas paid.—Some could not be bribed.—Mr. Hardy.—His character.—Rejects all offers.—Charles Kendal Bushe.—His character.—Rejects all offers from Lord Castlereagh.—Peter Burrowes incorruptible.—His character and conduct.—Speech of Mr. Saurin against the Union—His character and conduct.—Foster's speech.—His character and conduct.—Lord Cornwallis's letter to Lord Mornington.—Remarks upon it.—Mr. George Ponsonby's motion.—Impatience of Government.—Introduce two bills.—Insurrection and Rebellion bills.—Invest the Army with great powers.—Government propose to buy the House of Commons, and pay 15,000*l.* for each borough abolished.—Letter on the subject to the Marquis of Donegal.—Expenses of the Union.—Mr. Plunket's celebrated attack on Government for their corrupt practices.—Character of Mr. Plunket.—Character of Mr. Ponsonby.—His motion to dissolve Parliament.—Sir John Parnell's speech.—Account of his family, the Poet and the Peer.—Remarkable words of Mr. Saurin and Sir Lawrence Parsons as to the Union.—Exchange of the militias of the two countries.—The Fitzgerald indemnity bill.—Proceedings of the House of Lords.—Speech of Lord Clare.—Attacks Mr. Grattan.—Publishes his Speech.—Mr. Grattan's celebrated answer, and brilliant description of the men of 1782.

Such was pretty nearly the account of this transaction, which is thus particularized in order that a just opinion may be formed of the conduct and character of a Government that would induce persons to act as Mr. Corry did. These were the men employed by Mr. Pitt and his sub-agents to do their state business, and carry their Union. Apart from private considerations, and influenced solely by national ones, is there any person who can refrain from saying that a more unscrupulous set of men scarcely ever disgraced the annals of any country, and that their names and misdeeds

must descend to after ages with the execration of every honest and every virtuous mind.

The contest that had nigh proved fatal to Mr. Corry, restrained in some degree the military ardour of the Unionists, and lowered their fiery tone; the experiment appeared rather hazardous to the castle partisans, who though possessed of profligacy sufficient to undertake so desperate a venture as a Union, were, like most hirelings, desirous of enjoying in safety* the produce of their sale, and began to think they were only paid for the loss of character, but not of life; enough for treason, not enough for murder. Some of them grew discontented and disheartened: among them was one well known to the author, but whose name, from motives of delicacy, he suppresses; he was a sharp off-hand practising barrister, with great effrontery of mind and manner, a strength of lungs inexhaustible, a face that never blushed, some quickness, and considerable personal courage. Originally he had been adverse to the Union; he was induced, however, to vote for it, and having done so, he went to the law courts and abused it among his brethren without measure, declaring that it would be most pernicious to the country, and that he would in future oppose it; this reached the ears of the Government, and they sent to him, and after an interview with Lord Castlereagh, he was persuaded to go to the House and support the measure.†

It is probable that one of the results of the duel between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Corry, was to raise the price of the market, and Government felt the

* In a list of those who voted for the Union, which the author got from Mr. Reilly, a Unionist and member of the House, and carefully marked by him, appears this note opposite Mr. Martin's name, "*Two yeomanry corps on pay and not a man in either.*"

† He was rewarded by a legal and very lucrative office in the revenue department.

effect of having brought into Parliament a set of adventurers — persons not connected with the country—needy placemen—officers—pensioners —Englishmen—strangers—men without character or property; such persons were determined to strike a hard bargain, and one of them (Mr. M'Donald), being urged by the minister to support the measure, very coolly laid his hat across the Bar of the House, and declared that he would not vote for the Union, or take away his hat, till five thousand guineas were secured to him. His terms were complied with, and an undertaking to that effect was given.

Others were incorruptible. One individual, though oppressed almost by actual want, without fortune of his own or gain from his profession, with a family afflicted by the most trying and terrible illness, stood firm to his country—that man was Francis Hardy. He was a man of sterling public principle, but he wanted vigour and strength of mind to be a distinguished speaker in the House of Commons. He shone better in mixed companies, where he was always ready and willing, gentle and polite. His manners were courteous, easy, and agreeable. He had much anecdote, and told a story well and shortly. He had read a good deal of French and Italian literature, and formed himself on their models. In society he always appeared with a certain polish, and never said anything that any one could be ashamed of: you always felt pleased with his private manners and proud of his public principles.* His writings

* He had been in Paris with Mr. Grattan and Mr. Day in the time of their youth, when Marie Antoinette shone like light over the ripples of a whirlpool, but even in that gay capital, amidst the allurements of fashion, splendour, and wealth, Hardy was not insensible to the advan-

were honest and moderate, perhaps too moderate, but this resulted from a soft nature, and his History of Lord Charlemont surprised most of his friends, and among them Mr. Grattan, who did not imagine that Hardy could have written so well; he did not profess to write on the subject of the Union, for Lord Charlemont had died before that event, and it was not necessary for Hardy to do so; besides, he did not wish to create enemies for his children by giving the characters of the men at the Union, and telling the truth *that there were only seven men on the side of Government who were not bribed.**

Message after message was sent to Hardy that whatever he asked would be granted, still he refused. His own friends even advised him to yield, and when the die was cast, and the battle of the country lost, terms even at that late hour would have been accepted. His patron (Lord Granard) advised him to hesitate ere he refused; but Hardy remained true to his country and his conscience, and avoided the ignominy that would have followed him to the grave; "*mark'd with a blot damn'd in the book of Heaven.*"

> Vendidit hic auro patriam dominumque potentem
> Imposuit, fixit leges pretio atque refixit
> Ausi omnes immane nefas. . . . .

Another character equally noble, with a genius such as few men possess and few countries can boast of — with a ready humour, a playful and ardent disposition—with more of the milk of hu-

tages his country possessed. On one occasion, when walking up the grand staircase at the Tuilleries, after admiring the splendour of the palace, he turned to Mr. Grattan and Mr. Day, and said, "It is all very fine, but still they have not trial by jury."

It was in allusion to this visit of Mr. Grattan's, that Mr. Flood said when he concluded one of his poignant replies, "He is still so great that I dare say the Queen of France will have a song made on the name of Grattan."

* So Mr. Grattan used to say.

man nature than falls to the lot of most men—and with fewer of their faults, though with some of their errors and their weaknesses—was Charles Kendal Bushe. He was passionately fond of literature, his mind was cultivated and polished in the extreme, his manner of reading was charming,—it was a display of taste and elegance—his mode of narrating was excellent,—he never fell into the common error which shows the vulgar mind, making the circumstance the point and the point the circumstance. As an orator—graceful, fluent, plausible, and zealous—he clothed his ideas in a garb of rich and overflowing eloquence; with a voice that charmed, he modulated its tones so as to fall upon the ear with softness and almost with the sweetness of melody;* when he spoke his eye kindled, and a glow of fire animated his entire frame, and almost communicated itself to his auditors. He could depress or elevate his tones with singular felicity, and assume the grave or the gay character of speech with such happy success, that the most polished actor could not surpass him. Few were blessed by Providence with talents like those of Bushe, and few could boast of such noble and disinterested conduct as that which he displayed at this trying and momentous crisis. His public life almost began at the Union; he began well and never spoke better. His case was peculiar and interesting, and, for his character and that of his country, deserves to be recorded. His father had died owing considerable debts, which his son was not, however, in law bound to pay; but he considered that he was so in honour, and though encumbered by a large family, without fortune of his own, and with small professional rank at the time, he discharged them all.

* Such it was in his early days, but it grew severe by the practice at the bar and the wrangle of Nisi Prius.

Aware of his situation, the political vampire who then ruled—the spoliator of public honour and of private fame—summoned one of the familiars whom he kept in waiting to bribe the poor, to seduce the virtuous, and to entrap the unwary; he despatched him to Charles Bushe. The offer was made,—any sum, any terms that would be asked were to be complied with; but he refused every temptation. After this interview, when he reflected on the state of his affairs in ruin, and beheld his family so straitened in circumstances (he stated this to me himself)—

I threw myself in my chair, and for a moment almost doubted whether it was right in me to keep in such a state so many human beings, when I thought on the splendid offers I had refused,—offers that astonished, almost bewildered me.*

Charles Bushe was incorruptible,—he saved his honour; he would have saved his country too; and the doubt of which he spoke was the mere caprice of his fancy. Had his distress and his temptation been multiplied a hundred fold, he would have remained pure.

High on the list of able and sterling patriots stood Peter Burrowes. He possessed an excellent understanding, and a sound practical judgment. His powers of discrimination were such that men who had the most difficult matters to settle have gone to consult him, and he was never wrong. He had an honest, good-humoured openness that prepossessed every one in his favour; he was full of strong national feelings, generous in his disposition, humane, and benevolent; he was a sincere friend and kind relative, an incorruptible senator, and an honest Irishman. The earnestness of his manner was striking and peculiar; and

* He said nearly the same to his relation, Henry Amyas Bushe, "I did not think it possible such offers could be made—*they staggered me.*"

though he appeared over sanguine and eager in the view he took, whether of persons or of things, yet there was something so plainly ingenuous and unsuspecting in his nature, that he secured the esteem and won the confidence of all, whether friends or strangers. In relating anecdotes, he amused by the quaint and curious turn he gave to his story; though his voice and manner of delivery were somewhat against him, he threw the whole force of his mind into the thought, and seemed to labour with the idea that impressed him, till his words burst forth with fervour, and he carried persuasion to his hearers, because he seemed convinced himself. He was gifted with a very rare and a most amiable quality—a power not merely to forgive, but to forget an injury, and he never harboured in his mind a rancorous recollection. He loved to speak well of his fellow-creature, and when he could not do so he was silent. He scorned to stoop to the low and vulgar ways towards promotion, and rose superior to the petty arts that too often prevail in politics, and are not seldom practised in his profession. He despised money and disregarded office, if neither could be obtained without the sacrifice of principle, or his country's good, or of public virtue. He knew there was such a thing as fame which did not rest on the adventitious aid of vain titles or false honours that may be received during life, but on the retributive justice of posterity, that awards praise where it is justly due, and tells the virtuous man—"*Thou shalt not die but live;*" and he had within him a voice surer and more impartial than even Posterity's.

In early life* he displayed that independence of

* Mr. Burrowes was one of the first who proposed a resolution in favour of the Catholics (Mr. Grattan had first done it at Dungannon). A public meeting was held at the Exchange in Dublin in 1783, when the Volunteer Convention sat at the Rotunda. Burrowes was a delegate

mind which he preserved to the last, unaffected by the glitter that surrounds the great, or the temptations held out by the powerful and by the wealthy. The Beresfords could not seduce, the Chancellor could not bribe, nor the Minister buy him! From first to last he was an honest man. Being private tutor to a son of Mr. John Beresford (the first commissioner of revenue) when in the University of Dublin, an offer was made to him to travel with this young man, and, if he wished it, that a seat in Parliament should be provided for him; but one condition was required, namely, that his politics should coincide with those of his patron.* Mr. Burrowes had uniformly entertained Liberal opinions and genuine Irish feelings, so that any agreement on that point was impossible; the proposed mode of advancing his personal interests was declined, and the drudgery of the bar was preferred. Thus bereft of fortune, he pursued an independent course in preference to a connexion with a powerful family by whom he was held in esteem, and who would have secured for him promotion in his profession, and elevation to the counsels of the State.

His generous disposition may be judged of from his conduct to his relations. In the time of the unfortunate disturbances in '98, Mr. Burrowes's

from a corps of 400 men (of which John Kemble, the celebrated actor, was likewise member), and he proposed "That it be referred to a Committee to consider whether the admission of Catholics into the Constitution was not a measure that should be adopted in the plan of Reform then contemplated by the Volunteers." This proposal caused great emotion; the debate on the subject was adjourned, and in the interim many persons of distinction and influence called on Mr. Burrowes to dissuade him from the measure; but he remained firm, and would not yield. The question, however, was not entertained by the Convention. (See the letters of General Burgoyne and Lord Northington, and the conduct of Sir Boyle Roche and the Government, vol. iii. pp. 116, 128, 131.)

* In justice to the Beresfords, who have many private virtues, it must be said, that they held Mr. Peter Burrowes in the highest esteem to the last moment.

brother lost his life. He was opposed to him in politics; and hostile to the people, his house was attacked, burned, and everything consumed; his daughter remained helpless, but Mr. Burrowes protected her, and gave her an annuity for her support. So kind and liberal was he, that at one time he supported nearly all his relatives, and they were not inconsiderable in number.

At the period of the Union he came into Parliament, and his pen, his voice, his vote, were all used in behalf of Ireland. The panegyric he delivered upon Mr. Grattan does honour to him who gave and him who received it. At the bar he proved an able counsel and strenuous advocate. To a sound opinion he united the knowledge of law and the love of the constitution, and improved the former by his admiration for the latter. He was often engaged in the defence of the United Irishmen, and was more in their secrets than most men; he discharged his professional duty towards them with courage and fidelity. He was an intimate friend and great admirer of the Emmet family, and this connexion probably brought him into a patriotic though perilous contact with that party.

He was Counsel for the Roman Catholic delegates in 1811 and 1812 after the arrest of Lord Fingal when, by the imprudence and misconduct of the Government, the Constitution was daringly violated, the Catholics insulted, and the country convulsed from centre to circumference.

Mr. Burrowes had to contend for them against hired Sheriffs and packed Juries,* and by surprising good fortune and great ability he obtained a verdict for his client.

The speech he made on that occasion was a

* On this trial of Kirwan it appeared that the list of the jury came from the pocket of the Under Secretary at the Castle—Sir Charles Saxton !!

masterpiece of forensic eloquence, profound argument, great legal reasoning, and sound constitutional doctrine. It remains an immortal testimony in favour of liberty. His friend the Solicitor-General (Charles Bushe) was opposed to him; and though he had the last address to the Jury, and made perhaps his effort at the bar, Mr. Burrowes triumphed, and his speech remained as a record not only of his success but of his superiority. He defeated his foes and surpassed his friend;* baffled the Castle, and acquitted the Catholic.

The Opposition Members, notwithstanding their repeated defeats, still sustained the contest with a praiseworthy spirit and determined perseverance. Accordingly, when the House was again in Committee, on the 21st February, and Lord Castlereagh moved the second resolution, it was ably resisted by Mr. Saurin, Lord Corry, Mr. O'Donnell, and Mr. Tighe, who moved an adjournment; Mr. Saurin delivered a most able and justly celebrated speech against the measure; and thus ended—

I, then, would ask the noble Lord, and he is bound to answer it to this House and to the nation, what are the possible measures, what the acts, what the regulations, which the wisdom, of his Majesty's Ministers may deem fit and salutary for this country, and calculated to tranquillize it? and which he could venture to say would or could be passed in the Parliament magnificently styled Imperial, that would not and might not be passed in the Parliament of Ireland? If none—is Union then a measure to tranquillize Ireland? Can it tranquillize Ireland to see its Parliament extinguished, under which it has enjoyed liberty and security?—a Parliament that has extended to the subjects of this country the benefits of the *Habeas Corpus* Bill;

* Charles Bushe (Solicitor-General) was mistaken in his construction of the Convention Act; the opinions of Lord Erskine, Sir Samuel Romilly, and Sir Arthur Pigott were better, and were against him. If they were bad constitutional lawyers in Ireland, it must have been that there was no constitution there. Sir Arthur Pigott (Attorney-General) told the author that Burrowes's speech was unanswerable.

has declared a standing army in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament, contrary to law; has established the independence of the Judges of the land; *has cherished, has secured, and promoted, the trade, the manufacture, and the agriculture of Ireland, now flourishing in an unexampled degree;* that shelters and protects the people of this country against the insolence of office and the encroachments of authority; *ensures to this country the residence of its nobility and gentry, by furnishing to men of rank and education an honourable occupation,* the objects of honest ambition and honourable exertion; ensures to the country the enjoyment of that patronage with which the King is entrusted; renders this country the seat of arts; that improves and embellishes society; that gives to this country a metropolis vieing in extent and beauty with the first cities in Europe; that makes the distinction in a country between a nation and a province. These are the benefits and blessings of a resident independent Legislature!!

The resolution was carried without a division, and Mr. Tighe's motion rejected.

William Saurin was descended from a French family that took refuge in Ireland after the revocation of the edict of Nantes. He was called to the bar in 1780, and raised himself by his ability to the first rank in his profession. He kept aloof from public life until danger threatened his country;* then he came forward, and interposed in a noble manner in her defence. His style of speaking was grave and imposing; his delivery was earnest and impressive; so that he both interested and persuaded. He was a good debater; his reasoning was sound and logical; but he was neither eloquent nor brilliant. His legal knowledge was extensive; and served to strengthen the constitutional doctrines he laid down, and which he advanced in the boldest and most fearless manner in support of the liberties of his

* He was so respected by his brethren at the bar, that they at once elected him as captain to command the Lawyers' Corps of Yeomanry 1798.

country; and in consequence, his conduct at the Union procured for him universal admiration.

His private character was modest and moral, and stood deservedly high; and he enjoyed a reputation without a blemish. In his domestic circle he was amiable; his manners were easy and gentle, and his temper calm and unruffled. This was the more surprising, as it was least expected, for he had a *sombre* air, a dark and overhanging brow, and a saturnine cast of countenance. Even his smile was tinged with severity, and his laugh (when he did laugh) was deep and hollow. Altogether, he would have been an excellent model for the portrait of a puritan in the days of Cromwell. Notwithstanding this cold and unprepossessing exterior, he was much liked in private; and had a number of personal friends, and among them those who were diametrically opposed to him in politics. They not only sought for but relished his society.

Narrowness of mind was Saurin's misfortune—it seemed as if the edict of Nantes was evermore floating before his eyes, and that its revocation had filled his mind with supernatural horrors — thus when the Catholic question came on, he fell into a religious trance, and ended his political life in a state of *somnambulism*, — he could see, and he could walk, but in other respects was wholly irrational and insensible; he deluded himself by imaginary fears, and remained to the last in a state of political aberration. The proceedings that he instituted against the Roman Catholics in 1811 and 1812,* were unconstitutional and indefensible, and his doctrine on the Convention Bill was arbitrary in the extreme.

* Trials of Dr. Sheridan in 1811, and of Thomas Kirwan in 1812, on indictments under the Convention Act. Account of the jury panel arrayed by the Castle Sheriff on the second trial, as stated in Mr. Burrowes's speech, published Dublin, 1812. Dr. Sheridan was acquitted; Mr. Kirwan was found guilty.

As a public prosecutor he was injudicious, severe, and oppressive; he allowed his religious prejudices to interfere and master him, and he suffered himself to be dragged along with a furious faction and an intemperate court party that was at war with the people. The contest was angry and personal, and the mutual provocations bitter and exasperating.* Yet amid this racking strife he generally preserved a placid temper, and had address to disguise if not to subdue his wrath, so that he was seldom, if ever, thrown off his guard. His influence during the Tory administration which so long afflicted Ireland before the arrival of Lord Wellesley, was paramount and omnipotent — all those feelings of affection for his native country, which had shone forth so vividly and generously at the period of the Union, appeared to have been lost in the fear, if not the detestation, with which he regarded every effort to ameliorate the condition of the Catholic people; his whole life after 1800, was a continued struggle against every principle that savoured of, and every man who supported religious liberty. He was incapable of doing what he believed to be a mean action, and possessed a lofty and commendable pride, but he was essentially a religious bigot; and there were few acts, no matter how flagrant or oppressive, that his religious antipathies might not have induced him to perform.† The system of packing juries with heated religious partisans flourished, in the most mischievous luxuriance, under his sway; at no other period had the insolence of the Orange faction a more unrestrained and licentious dominion; at no other period did the Catholic

* Duel, death of Mr. d'Esterre; challenge, O'Connell and Mr. (Sir Robert) Peel.

† His letter to Lord Norbury about jurors of "*the right sort*," will not easily be forgotten. His prosecutions of the press increased more than ever.

Barrister, or the Liberal Protestant Barrister, find the obstacles to his advancement more insuperable, than while the Bar was represented by Mr. Saurin as Attorney-General, and modelled by Lord Manners as Chancellor. With the accession of Lord Wellesley to power in Ireland, his overgrown influence was at an end; for up to that moment he had been virtually the Governor of Ireland. He complained of ill treatment from the new administration; but it was the change in the system of policy; the advance from bigotry to toleration; from darkness to light, that galled and grieved him.* After the Union he fell into the fatal error that Foster had committed before it;—he had defended and stood up for Ireland as a people—he now depreciated and divided her and strove to sink her as a sect; he had avoided these dangerous shoals at the commencement of his voyage, but he was thrown upon them afterwards, and there he shattered all his fortunes; office was his ruin, he sunk by accepting it, and he would have stood high and respected if he had kept free from its trammels and had not been embarrassed by that unpopular appendage (the Attorney-Generalship)—it led him towards a mimic court (the rabble rout of Comus† without its elegance), and made him live among a set whose opinions he could not value, and whose conduct he could not respect. This desperate fidelity was ill rewarded by the party whose fortunes he had embraced,‡ and in the

* An anecdote is related of Lord Wellesley which explains the feelings that rankled in the ex-Attorney-General's heart: "I have been told," said the Viceroy, "that I have ill-treated Mr. Saurin. I offered him the chief justiceship of the King's Bench; *that* was not ill-treating him: I offered him an English Peerage; *that* was not ill-treating him: I did *not*, it is true, continue him in the Viceroyalty of Ireland, for I," said Lord Wellesley, with increasing animation, "I am the Viceroy of Ireland!"

† The Duke of Richmond's administration.

‡ He was attorney-general from 1807, when the Whig party left office, to 1822, when they returned.

end he was passed by and neglected by them. On the whole, his case affords a striking instance how hazardous and unwise it is for any Irishman, Whig or Tory, Protestant or Catholic, to embark his fame and fortunes with any other party except that of his country. Had this man lived and died the *Saurin* of 1800, the entire nation would have joined to inscribe on his tomb an epitaph that would have rendered his name immortal!

On the 27th of February, the subject of the Union was again debated in Committee, when Mr. Foster made another admirable speech; he entered at considerable length into the entire question, the disgrace the Peerage were to undergo; the small number of representatives from Ireland in comparison with the number from England and Scotland; he entered on the religious part of the question, and did justice to the Catholics. It was unfortunate that his mind had not expanded itself at an earlier period.

Is the Irish Parliament to be so degraded, that it cannot discuss every question of Irish concern, and that a distant Parliament sitting in a distant land, is more adequate to it, or will give more content by its decision?—No, sir, we are not so lost to all duty, to all love of our country, to all integrity, that we are not to be trusted with the concerns of Ireland.

I will tell the Right Hon. Gentleman, why I do not join that question with the Union. The Union seeks to take away our Parliament, our freedom, and our prosperity; the Catholic is equally a native of Ireland, equally bound by duty, by inclination to his country; he sees with us the danger of the attack, and joins with the Protestant to prevent its approach, and save the constitution; he is wise in doing so—all differences are lost, they are asleep in this common cause, he joins heart to heart with his fellow-subjects, to oppose the common enemy, this damnable, destructive, and I had almost said, deceitful measure; if I were to ransack every dictionary in the

English language, I could not find words strong enough to express my abhorrence of the plan, or my dread of its fatal consequences.

You talk of its restoring tranquillity—it is but talk—will taking men of property out of the country do it? will a plan full of the seeds of jealousy and discontent effect it? Will depriving a nation of the liberty which it has acquired, and to which it is devoted, ensure content?—If religious jealousies disturb its quiet, are they to be allayed by a British Parliament?—No, sir, leave our own concerns to our own Parliament, we are equal to their management—and we will not yield in wisdom, liberality, patriotism, or firmness, to any Parliament that can sit in Britain, formed on new speculations, unknown to the Constitution.

But I ask, if those jealousies have disturbed our quiet, who roused them? I answer, that bench!—not the noble lord, but those who then sat on that bench—British, not Irish councils, roused them! and British, not Irish councils, now propose this Union.

Let us look back to 1782 — Irish spirit and British liberality removed all jealousies at that period: not one has occurred since between the kingdoms, and British councils now come forward to undo the measures of 1782 —to rouse, by this ill-timed project, public apprehension, and to put us into the situation we were in before that period, when continued jealousies retarded our prosperity, and distracted our tranquillity.

Review the whole measure; it leaves to us every appendage of a kingdom, except what constitutes the essence of independence, a resident Parliament—separate state, separate establishment, separate exchequer, separate debt, separate courts, separate laws, the lord lieutenant, and the castle, all remain; we shall become a colony on the worst of terms, paying a settled system of contribution, to be levied by laws not of our own making—and what are the benefits in return? None pretended, except in trade and revenue, which I have shown you to be the reverse of benefits — but if they were ever so great, I would spurn the offer, to be purchased by our liberty; neither revenue or trade will remain where the spirit of liberty ceases to be their foundation, and nothing can prosper in a state which gives up its freedom.—I declare most solemnly, that if England could give us all her

revenue and all her trade, I would not barter for them the free constitution of my country. Our wealth, our properties, our personal exertions are all devoted to her support—our freedom is our inheritance, and with it we cannot barter.

Mr. Foster was the son of the Chief Baron of the Exchequer—he was educated in Ireland, and called to the Bar in 1766, but soon left it for politics. He was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1785, and on the resignation of Mr. Pery in 1786, was chosen Speaker of the House of Commons. Notwithstanding some blemishes in his public character, he was endowed with many excellent qualities—his measures in support of the Corn Trade of Ireland* were good, he followed in this respect the track of Lord Pery, and was of great utility to his country; his care and personal attention to the Linen and Cotton manufactures were highly serviceable to the people, and redounded greatly to his credit. He had surprising knowledge of the resources of Ireland, her trade, her commerce, and her capabilities. His design in proposing the original commercial propositions in 1785 was excellent; he forbore to urge those that were so faithlessly sent from England, and acted a wise and judicious part. He was an Irishman, though too much of a courtier, and too little inclined to the people; his commencement in Ireland was bad, but his conclusion was good. At his outset he supported a perpetual Mutiny Bill—opposed Free Trade in 1779, and opposed Independence in 1781, these however were times when England was all dominant, and few men dared to speak or even think for their country; but his fatal error was hostility to

* In 1770, Ireland could not supply her people with bread, but these measures of Mr. Pery and Mr. Foster enabled her not only to feed them, but to export in large quantities.

the Catholics—on this question he discovered his mistake too late, and in 1800 he found at last how vain it was to contend for the freedom of a country without the aid of all her people. When Speaker of the Lower House he abridged the privileges of the Commons, limiting the space usually allotted to them in the gallery of the House, and appropriating it to the attendants of the Court, and here he acted in a partial and arbitrary as well as an unconstitutional manner. In 1795, at the time of Lord Fitzwilliam's short administration, he was sent for by the advisers of the Whig party, and was consulted by them in preference to Mr. Beresford; the reason was that Foster was an Irishman attached to Ireland, though usually supporting Government, but Mr. Beresford was an English slave, though in private he was an honourable man. Foster was at no period ever popular, and his conduct in '98 was abominably bad, but at the Union he redeemed himself; his arguments on that subject were excellent and unanswerable, and it was a fortunate circumstance for Ireland that he was friendly to her at that crisis, as a speech from him against her would have been highly prejudicial to her interests. He did not possess any eloquence, but had a calm delivery—his manner was neither impassioned nor vehement, but he was accurate and firm; his argument was generally able, his positions well arranged, close, and regular; his knowledge of the financial affairs of Ireland was extensive, and his speeches on her trade and commerce at the time of the Union were unrivalled and never answered.

He received little attention from Mr. Pitt after the Union, and was not regarded by him; the latter remembered that Mr. Foster called his speech on that subject *a paltry production*, and

his knowledge of finance was designedly disparaged in England; he was, however, created Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland, on the retirement of Mr. Corry, and supported the Corn Bill in 1815, with a view to promote the agriculture of Ireland. On the whole he was a remarkable Irishman, and so long as Ireland need refer to the History of the Union for proof that it was neither a gain nor a compact her advocates will consult Mr. Foster's speeches.

Notwithstanding the majorities that had been procured, Government appear to have entertained some apprehensions as to their final success; the letter of the Lord Lieutenant to his friend and successor in India, reveals his opinion as to the "*cold* and *languid*" character of his party contrasted with the zeal and activity of the others—when the letter has been read it shall be characterized as it deserves.

THE MARQUIS OF CORNWALLIS TO LORD MORNINGTON.

Dublin Castle, 2nd March, 1800.

* * * * Your Correspondents in England will probably tell you that every thing is going on well in Ireland, and that the *Union* will be carried with ease, but believe me the task will turn out more difficult than *they imagine*, and although I trust that we shall ultimately succeed; it will be after a long and violent contest, *the leaders of the Opposition are able*, and their followers are animated with that zeal which vanity, *prejudice, and self-interest naturally inspire. Mr. Grattan has come forward; their cause is espoused in distant parts of the kingdom by the lower class, who looked on with indifference as long as faction was untainted by disloyalty.* We have a majority of between *forty* and *fifty*, scarcely any of whom will I believe desert from us—*but they are in general cold and languid friends—and it is very difficult to procure such an attendance as the importance of the case and the activity and unfair dealing of the enemy render necessary for our daily security.*

CORNWALLIS.

Such is the letter of the representative of royalty, the head and director of the band of contractors who were *per fas aut nefas* to carry the Union, the man who bought and sold, bribed and bullied, left no class in the state from the highest to the lowest unapproached, unpolluted, and who alike contaminated the bench of justice and the bench of bishops; it well became this Viceroy, who harboured in his Castle the wretch that went to Tinnehinch to entrap Mr. Grattan,* who patronized the Assassination Club, who not only countenanced but promoted† the man who set on others to shoot their political opponents; it well became him to call the honourable efforts of the Irish on behalf of their liberties—the effect of "*vanity, prejudice, and self-interest,*" and to characterize Mr. Grattan and the highest men in the country as a "*faction tainted by disloyalty.*"

No circumstances should have induced Lord Cornwallis to act as he did. In the ensuing year he in part admitted his error, because he retired from the administration on the ground that there was a breach of the understanding upon which he embarked in the Union, namely, the Emancipation of the Catholics. He states, that his private opinion was long in their favour, and that this concession was intended by the ministers, and was essential to secure to the empire the full benefit of the Union. He further admitted, as appears by a letter of Lord Redesdale's (Chancellor of Ireland) in 1802, *that he and Lord*

* In the account of *Secret Service Money*, vouched by the affidavit of Edward Cooke, Esq., Under Secretary in 1798, 1800, and 1801, this item appears:—*For rooms in the Castle for Hughes since June* 1798, *fifty guineas.—Public Papers*, No. XIV. See *Appendix, Dr. Madden*, vol. ii.

† Mr. St. George Daly (who, at the meeting of the Castle party, said that "*he had taken his man already,*" recommending all to do the same) was promoted, on the dismissal of Mr. James Fitzgerald, Prime Serjeant.

Castlereagh were both pledged to the Catholics, and that such were their expressions;* however, although he did not assent to the violation of the compact, he assisted in the sale, and this stain will for ever be attached to his name. History will record his ignominious conduct in Ireland while it commemorates his disgraceful capture in America, and notwithstanding his vaunted services in the East, the tears of India will rather augment than obliterate the disgrace.†

On the 4th of March, Mr. George Ponsonby renewed his efforts against the Union, and brought forward a motion of address to His Majesty. He stated that twenty-six counties and most of the principal cities and towns, had petitioned against the measure; that toward the close of the last session of Parliament, and since that period, no less than sixty three members had vacated their seats by accepting the Escheatorship of Munster, a nominal office similar to the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds; that in the last Parliament the measure had been rejected, but that, since and by means of the Place Bill, the House had not only entered on the subject, but voted the principle. He then proposed three resolutions, first, that it was the constitutional right of the subject to petition; that during the session petitions from twenty-six counties, besides several cities and towns, had been presented against the measure of Union; that these resolutions be laid before the Lord

* See Lord Redesdale's letter to Lord Eldon, May, 1802, where he uses these words, "Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh *are both pledged*, AS THEY SAY, to the Catholics." Yet Lord Castlereagh denied in 1810, on Mr. Grattan's motion in favour of the Catholics, that any pledges were given by him or Lord Cornwallis!—See *Lord Eldon's Life*, vol. i.

† When Lord Clive roturned from his eastern conquests, he built a splendid mansion; it was inhabited too soon and the walls were dripping wet, upon which *a friend* observed, "*These are the tears of India!*"

Lieutenant, with an address praying that they be laid before His Majesty.

Mr. Saurin said, "that the measure went fundamentally to alter the constitution or rather to subvert it and substitute another, he denied that they could do this, they could not change the constitution without the consent or will of the people." Mr. Fox said, "that the people of Ireland had for six hundred years lived over a sleeping volcano, and that it must end." Plunket said, "that if Government passed the measure against the consent of the people of Ireland, the act will want all the attributes of the law, let the people of England beware lest their plan of subjugating and enslaving Ireland be not calculated to prepare the way for the slavery of England herself; the progress of the Minister towards simplicity of government makes it more likely; it is the simplicity of despotism to which all his measures tend." These resolutions were supported by Lord Corry, Colonel Barry, Stuart of Killymoon, Dawson, Lambert and Burrowes. Lord Castlereagh proposed the adjournment, which was carried by 155 to 107. Decisive and effectual as were these majorities, yet they appeared feeble and languid in the eyes of the Military Chief Governor, he sought to cut short these difficulties which he stated in his letter to Lord Mornington, and as if he could brook no delay, and could not even patiently wait the approaching demise of the Constitution, he determined to expedite it by every means in his power, and again applied but with accumulated force his two favourite engines of destruction—terror and bribery. On the 8th of March his Attorney-General (Toler) brought in a bill more effectually to suppress the insurrection, and on the 18th his Solicitor-General brought in a bill to vest the

military with the jurisdiction and powers which the magistrates had under the Insurrection Act. Thus, by appointing to the commission of the peace, which already possessed rather an unlimited jurisdiction, the officers of the army, who had neither property nor connections in the country where they acted, or in any part of Ireland, they in effect transformed a civil into a military government. On the ensuing day the abominable bill was committed and carried — the numbers being 140 to 56 against it.

This measure was followed up by another of the same character, and on the 11th of March, the Attorney-General (Toler) brought in a Rebellion Bill, which enacted martial law, and gave to the Lord Lieutenant the power to name upon courts-martial any officers or persons he chose, and made his certificate conclusive evidence on behalf of those who formed this tribunal, so as to protect them from the consequences of any excesses they might be guilty of under colour of the extraordinary powers vested in them; if a rebellion had existed, such an act would even then have been considered an outrageous measure, but after a period of two years there could not be any apology for its introduction. Mr. Peter Burrowes opposed it most ably, supported by Mr. Plunket, Parsons, Tighe, and Dawson; Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Toler, and Dr. Duigenan contended for it vehemently; five repeated divisions took place with a view to arrest its progress, but they were unsuccessful and it passed the Committee.

Let it not be supposed that these bills were suffered to lie dormant on the statute book; the military, being transformed into magistrates, became active civil officers, and administered the laws as if trained up in the halls of Westminster

and the Four Courts. A court-martial was held in Limerick by Sir James Duff,* to "try any persons for rebellion, sedition, or *any crimes connected therewith;*" such was the notice, and accordingly they tried three countrymen for burglary in attacking a dwelling-house.

The remaining measure of Government was of so astounding a nature, such a daring violation of every principle of justice and even decency, one of such wholesale bribery and turpitude, that it was carefully reserved for the last, and after the principle of the Union had been agreed to. The House having been prevailed on to go so far; any hesitation to advance still further in iniquity, and wade through every offensive measure, was soon overcome. The plan was to expend a million and a half in direct sums for the purchase of the boroughs: in other words, to buy the House of Commons.

Fifteen thousand pounds was the sum to be awarded to each borough, and commissioners were subsequently to be appointed to allocate the sums to all who had an interest, or set up any claim; and accordingly, as in the case of Maryborough, individuals who had but a remote right, were considered and recompensed; this wholesale purchase was carried on with most barefaced effrontery on the part of the purchaser as well as the seller. The subjoined letter is one of the specimens of the spirit of the times, and shows the mischief a corrupt minister can occasion when he thus contaminates the whole society.

* He was the officer in command of the troops who put to death in cold blood a number of insurgents in the Curragh of Kildare, in 1798, after they had surrendered and yielded up their arms on the understanding that they were to be protected. An excuse has been offered for this—AN EXCUSE! for the massacre of unarmed powerless peasants to whom faith had been pledged!

EDWARD MAY TO THE MARQUIS OF DONEGAL.

MY DEAR LORD,

I have just seen a letter informing me that Mr. Congreve has written to you, and that he is ready to resign his seat. I have sent to Dublin desiring the necessary papers for him to sign to be sent to you, which be so good as to forward to him requesting him to sign them, and send them either to me in Waterford, or to the proper officer in Dublin—or enclose me a letter to him desiring him to sign the papers. As I have ordered duplicates to be sent to me, I can get it done by sending some one to him.

I beg you will not delay answering this, *as Lord Castlereagh is just arrived, and the parliamentary business will be immediately concluded. When compensation is made for the borough of Antrim, I think you should make a demand.* You have the returning officer. You are Lord of the Manor, and could have commanded a great power there. *I think you may get seven thousand pounds for your share.* Your father always supported the Skeffington family as near relations. I would not move in this until I heard from you; let me know your opinion and I will act accordingly when I go to Dublin, but you should not delay. Lord Masereene will claim the whole. *Why should not you do what every other man in the kingdom does!*

Believe me, sincerely yours,

EDWARD MAY.

Clonmel, October 23, 1800.

How prophetic the admonition of Mr. Grattan when, years before, he cautioned the country against the Ministry, when in '96 he complained of the conduct of Government, and repeated the words Lord Clare had dared to use in the House of Commons, that half a million had formerly been expended in buying the House, and that half a million would be required again. At that time Mr. Grattan emphatically told the people that they should extinguish the Minister, or he would extinguish the country. The event now proved the truth of those expressions; that infa-

mous project was now on the point of being carried into effect; and a regular sale and barter of the people's rights and liberties was about being accomplished. The sum had been tripled, and one million and a half was to be the price of the purchase. Thus the money was extracted from the pockets of the Irish, in order to buy the persons who sold them; so that, in fact, the nation paid for its own extinction. Ireland has always been compelled to feed the assassin who stabs her to the heart.

The shameful and enormous amount of money expended in this horrid traffic appears in the public accounts. On the 25th March, 1798 (the public accounts were always made up to that day), the funded debt of Ireland amounted to 9,275,000*l.*; on the 25th March, 1799, after the insurrection was over, the funded debt amounted to 14,920,000*l.*; and on the 1st January, 1801, it had risen to 26,841,000*l.* It is not to be believed that the expenses attendant on the insurrection could have amounted to seventeen millions and a half (the increase from '98 to 1801). The secret service money (a most important item in the rebellion budget of the Castle), let it be recollected, was but 53,000*l.*; so that the purchase of the boroughs and of the members were the grand items of expense. Such a profligate and daring appropriation of public money; its audacity, its infamy, roused the just indignation of the Opposition; and Mr. George Ponsonby gave notice that he should, on Thursday, 13th of March next, bring forward a resolution on the subject of the proposed measure for devoting the money of the people to purchase the representatives of the country, under the colour of compensating boroughmongers.

Mr. Plunket, rising, with indignation exclaimed,

I ask the noble Lord to answer now. The Committee has gone through the legislative part of the measure, in which, I understood by the noble Lord's statement, that he meant to have introduced a proposal for compensation to the owners of boroughs, in consideration of an Union. Am I to understand, by the noble Lord not having brought forward that proposal now, that he has abandoned it? because, if the noble Lord has decency enough to abandon so infamous, so base a part of his plan, as that of employing the money of the people to buy up their representatives, he deserves credit; and I call upon him now to stand up in his place and avow the abandonment, in order that *the public mind may be calmed upon a subject of such abomination,* so irritating to their feelings, so insulting to the honour of their country; and in order that no base miscreant—however honourable or noble his rank, however powerful his influence, who had the meanness and criminality to listen to the corrupt and degrading proposal of purchasing from him the representative rights of his country for fifteen, twenty, or forty thousand pounds, to be wrung from the bowels of his miserable country, and afterwards have the baseness to boast of his venality—may continue to exult in his infamous and corrupt triumph over every principle of national honour and national justice.

This bold and animated appeal, delivered in Mr. Plunket's severe and caustic manner, and conveyed in such scathing language, produced no effect on the cold temperament of Lord Castlereagh. He quailed before his opponent, and was silent. This is the meagre statement of all that remains of the most animated, spirited speech, which created so deep a sensation in the House.

The speaker was no ordinary character.

Of all those who came forward at this important crisis, William Conyngham Plunket stood the first. He was returned in 1797, for the same place that Mr. Grattan had represented on his first entrance into Parliament—the Borough of Charlemont; for it was the good fortune of its noble proprietor to have patronized two of the

ablest men who ever appeared in any age of any country, and at the most eventful periods of Ireland's history (the most brilliant epoch at one time, the most disastrous at the other)—Mr. Grattan in 1782, Mr. Plunket in 1800. The latter came forward to defend what the former had so nobly earned; and both did honour to the principles and virtues of that illustrious personage, who in early life had encouraged their patriotic efforts, shared in all the national labour, and justly participated in the glory of his country, and who also had the good fortune to die before he could behold the destruction of that constitution which he had taken such pains and such pride in establishing.

Mr. Plunket was a deep reader, a profound thinker, and a sagacious observer of mankind. He could learn quicker than any man; at one view he perceived the tendency of a measure, and saw from afar its errors and its consequences. His power of perception was great; his power of discrimination greater; and the clearness of his intellect was surprising. He was full of sense and judgment; he was a close and acute reasoner, a powerful debater, and most argumentative even when most eloquent. His speeches were iron-bound on all sides; solid and compact; never exposing a weak point to his adversary. His eye discovered not merely reflection, but command; and his irony was the most effective and most to be dreaded; it was not simply dissecting the human body, but flaying it alive. When he arraigned Lord Castlereagh for his plan to buy the members, by a million and a half to be expended for the purchase of the boroughs, it was more than the denunciation of an injured and indignant mortal—it was fire snatched from above; he soared beyond the low region where he was

placed, to draw from a superior armoury the fittest weapons to defend his country, and poured down on the devoted head of her implacable foe the storm, and tempest, and lightning of his anger. All his speeches were remarkable, but his finest speeches were most finished performances; they were master-pieces of oratory;* they contained profound views, and answered every thing. His speech on the Catholic question, in the Imperial Parliament, will long be remembered. He put forward the strength of their case in a manner that not only caught the auditory, but drew from one† of the greatest opponents of their claims the remark, that Plunket had done more to advance their cause in the House than any of their advocates; and from another, that his talents had excited the highest admiration, and his convincing speech would never be forgotten.‡ His speech on the French war in 1815 was powerful and masterly; no man in the House of Commons could have put the several cases of right to go to war, and of the right to interfere with the government of other States, in so powerful a manner; so clear, and each so distinct, like a stream that pours from the rock, strong and pellucid. His pleading in the case of the King against O'Grady was a master-piece of forensic ability; so much so, that it was stated in private by one of the Judges,§ that *he had never known* what argument was until he heard Plunket in that cause. A common observer might consider him cold and cautious in private, but that was not his cha-

* Mr. Whitbread, in the debate of May, 1808, said, his brilliant talents and splendid eloquence at once convinced and delighted.

† Sir Robert Peel; and see Lord Dudley's Letters to the Bishop of Llandaff, p. 280.

‡ Lord Castlereagh, in debates on the Catholic question.

§ St. George Daly (brother of Denis) in a conversation with his nephew, the Bishop of Cashel.

racter; he possessed a humour at once agreeable and instructive, and in the minutest things he showed that his understanding was of the first order.

Take him altogether, he was an extraordinary man. The son of a worthy Presbyterian clergyman in the north of Ireland, possessed of a small fortune, who died leaving a large family with little to support them, and this individual then a very young child. Deprived of his father, he managed to procure for himself the best education, and to gain the highest name in the University of Dublin; so high that he would not even accept a fellowship if it had been conferred upon him. He thence raised himself at the bar, and became a most distinguished advocate. He then got into the Parliament of both kingdoms; the Irish Parliament first, the Imperial Parliament afterwards. He was advanced to the highest offices in the State — Attorney General, Chief Justice, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He was offered the Rolls in England, and finally received a British Peerage. All this he did—not by dint of art or money—not by stooping to the vulgar ways of low ambition, or of crafty pride—not, as Lord Clare did, by abusing and selling his country—nor, as Lord Eldon did, by cringing and crouching to royalty; he excelled every where, and succeeded in almost every thing; he upheld the rights of Ireland, defended her cause, and advanced himself solely by his gigantic abilities and fearless energy.*

In this catalogue George Ponsonby cannot be omitted. His house had long ruled in Ireland;

* He showed great fidelity to principle—he refused the office of attorney-general when Mr. Fox's party left power in 1807, and thereby sacrificed upwards of 100,000*l.* Two of the leading members of the new government wrote to say, he might resume office and vote as he pleased, but he refused the offer and disdained to sacrifice his principles.

and, though defective in some points, was not a bad government for the country. He voted with Mr. Grattan in 1782, on the question of independence, and at the present crisis he exerted himself nobly, and struggled to preserve her constitution. He did so with zeal, ability, and spirit. Some of his speeches were worthy of the cause; those in 1799 were bold and masterly, particularly that in which he addressed Lord Castlereagh with so much sarcasm and severity. He acquired great credit; and when he went to the Parliament of another country, he carried with him the just fame he had acquired by defending his own. He had been bred to the bar, and did his business well. He spoke on the case of the fiats in 1790, and opposed the arbitrary doctrine of the King's Bench in a manner at once impressive and admirable, and that evinced his knowledge of law and his love of the constitution.

As a judge he was upright and efficient, and gave general satisfaction; but he sat too short a time to establish his reputation.

When he entered on the duties of Chancellor in 1806, he found an arrear of six years, 600 motions, and 427 causes. He cleared all the motions and 200 of the causes, besides the usual business of the Court; and if he had staid in office longer, he would have cleared all.

He had too much the habits of a lawyer, and spoke by paragraphs, which rather tires the ear; and is not a style, but a repetition of curt sentences. In this respect his manner was deficient; but his great fault was, that he did not read sufficiently to get to the bottom of his subject. He did not go as deep as he could, and not always as deep as he ought; he made up his mind without sufficient information; so that although in debate he was a very prudent man, yet when he came to

act he was not so: slow in council, but precipitate in action.

He possessed a love of liberty, and of a sort that would not suffer it to overturn the Government. His aristocracy was not a bad one; he was of use to Ireland, and deserved well of her; he had a public mind, and felt for his country; he had a just reserved sense of her injuries, and would not omit any occasion to redress them; he was a good patron and a good father, and had a good understanding. His voice was soft and pleasing; his manner calm and impressive; his temper unruffled and happy; vivacity characterised his mind, and generosity his disposition.* He was an able speaker, and possessed an argumentative humour, a cunning shrewdness, and a knowledge of the folly of mankind. Unfortunately he yielded too much to narrow sentiments, and had a love of engrossing all consultation, and doing all business himself. He was too fond of patronage and monopoly, and affected such a mystery in every thing that it impaired his popularity. He acted nobly at the Union, and after it he went to England with a great reputation; and in his new situation he not only upheld but increased it. He did what none of the first Englishmen would undertake; he headed their party. His success surprised every one, and that among a people who require great statement and great knowledge of detail. The office of leader of the Opposition in the Imperial Parliament was forced upon him. Lord Grey wished to avoid it; Lord Henry Petty† was not anxious to take it; and the party compelled Ponsonby to accept it. This was creditable to his character, but fatal to

* His conduct to Mr. Goold at the Union respecting Mr. Whaley's seat, was noble; see *ante*.

† Now Marquis of Lansdowne.

his fortune. He was more than generous—he was lavish.* As a leader he conducted himself with ability and discretion; he led the party into no difficulties, and kept them out of several scrapes.† He displayed good management and great discretion; did not shrink from any question; spoke well on the leading ones, and on that of Parliamentary privilege was distinguished. But he showed some violence in his opposition, and some weakness in his government.‡

On the 13th of March, Mr. George Ponsonby being unwell, was not able to make the motion he had given notice of, and it was submitted to the House by Sir John Parnell, but not without considerable cavil and objection on the part of Lord Castlereagh, who insisted that the motion of which notice had been given by Mr. Ponsonby could only be made by him. The Speaker, however, decided against Lord Castlereagh, and Sir John Parnell after presenting several petitions against the measure, proposed an address to his Majesty praying that he may be graciously pleased to dissolve the present Parliament and call a new one before any final arrangement shall be concluded in relation to the measure of a Legislative Union, he accompanied this motion by a very able speech, of which the following is an extract:—

"What is the foundation of the application of the people, and upon what grounds are they justified for soliciting the protection of their Parliament; they wish to avert the loss of their constitution, which they possess under the

* He paid 800*l.* a year to the Deputy of the Master of the Rolls, whom Mr. Curran insisted he had a right to remove from the office.

† In the cases of the Princess of Wales and of Norway.—See Parliamentary Debates.

‡ Mr. Curran, Mr. Hardy and others were not as promptly considered in 1806 as they deserved; but this was after the Union, and its natural consequence.

sanction of law, and under which they have hitherto lived free, and enjoyed increasing prosperity; they wish to avert a measure, which, from the unanimous evidence offered at your bar, threatens destruction to their commerce and manufactures.

"They wish to preserve tranquillity in Ireland and British connexion, both of which they consider to be in danger by this rash, unnecessary, and dangerous project —what is the equivalent held out to compensate them for the loss of their legal and established rights? A treaty which on the face of it admits that it is not to be permanent, which avows that its commercial regulations, injurious as they are in their present state, may become more so at the future discretion of one of the contracting parties, which places the proportion of the taxes to be paid by this country, in a similar situation, and which binds this country to pay a certain proportion of an unlimited and incalculable expense, before the measure should be completed. Must not the public mind naturally be turned to the manner in which it has been conducted, and to the means which have been used for carrying it into effect? It was introduced at a period of rebellion, when martial law had superseded the civil power—it was uncalled for on the part of Ireland, and rejected by its Parliament—why then has it been re-assumed, not as it has been alleged, from a change in the sense of the people, but from a change in the persons who compose this assembly —a much greater number than those who compose the minister's majority, gave their first vote in Parliament to alter its constitution; however respectable in their private character and fortunes, they could not be the best judges of the Parliamentary constitution, in which they had no experience — they in general represent boroughs where seats have been vacated by the power given in the place bill, though the minister refuses to take the sense of the counties by a dissolution of Parliament; he has not hesitated to appeal to the sense of the boroughs, by a partial change in the representation of Parliament. Are these new members in general more attached to Ireland from their birth and possessions than those gentlemen were whom they succeed? are we to attribute to these causes that they almost universally differ from them in their political opinions? When this question was first suggested, it appeared to me most dangerous in its future consequences.

I foresaw that by banishing the Irish gentry, it removed from the country those who by their authority were able to suppress popular tumult, and give efficacy to the laws; those who from their known loyalty had proved themselves to have afforded the best bond for British and Irish connexion. I foresaw that property would be lessened, and that the spirit of commerce would droop in a country which had surrendered its constitution. I would not be an accomplice in a measure pregnant with such mischievous consequences. I determined to make every personal sacrifice rather than concur in doing an injury to to my country. Under these impressions I propose the present measure. I am willing to surrender to my constituents the seat which they have conferred on me; a sacrifice which I trust will be adopted by other members of parliament, who are placed in a similar situation as myself—they will by doing so prove their liberality and their disinterestedness, preferring the interests of their constituents to their own. I trust that this house will hesitate before it adopts a measure unparalleled in the annals of history. No country possessed of legal, acknowledged, and undisputed rights, have ever voluntarily surrendered them, unawed by force, and undisturbed in their political and commercial possessions. I trust that the house will recollect that spirit which has ever marked the conduct of their ancestors, however the Irish character may have been degraded for the purpose of fabricating an argument to justify the present measure, it has ever been acknowledged to have been distinguished for its high and liberal spirit—I trust that the house will, by its conduct this night, support the national character, and save the country."

Sir John Parnell was an honest, straight-forward, independent man, possessed of considerable ability and much public spirit; as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was not deficient, and he served his country by his plan to reduce the interest of money. He was amiable in private, mild in disposition, but firm in mind and purpose. His conduct at the Union did him honour, and proved how warmly he was attached to the interests of his country, and, on this account he was dismissed

from the situation in which he had succeeded Mr. Foster when appointed Speaker in 1786. He was a personal friend of Mr. Grattan's, as appears from the occurrence regarding his office in 1795, and which affords no slight proof that he was a man of integrity. His son Henry was with him in Parliament, and both voted against the Union. Sir John was grandson to one of the judges of the King's Bench in Ireland, and grandnephew of Dr. Thomas Parnell the poet, the friend and cotemporary of Swift and of Pope, whose works are eulogised by Johnson and Goldsmith, and immortalized by Pope in his Epistle and Dedication to the Earl of Oxford.*

* "Such were the notes, thy once-loved poet sung,
'Till death untimely stopp'd his tuneful tongue.
Oh, just beheld, and lost! admir'd and mourn'd!
With softest manners, gentlest arts, adorn'd!
Blest in each science, blest in ev'ry strain!
Dear to the muse, to Harley dear in vain!
For him, thou oft hast bid the world attend,
Fond to forget the statesman in the friend:
For Swift and him, despis'd the farce of state
The sober follies of the wise and great;
Dext'rous, the craving, fawning crowd to quit,
And pleas'd to 'scape from flattery to wit.
Absent or dead, still let a friend be dear
(A sigh the absent claims, the dead a tear)
Recall those nights that clos'd thy toilsome days,
Still hear thy Parnell in his living lays:
Who careless, now, of int'rest, fame, or fate,
Perhaps forgets that Oxford ere was great,
Or, deeming meanest what we greatest call,
Beholds thee glorious only in thy fall."

Thomas Parnell, father of the poet and the judge, had left Congleton, the family residence in Cheshire, at the period of the Restoration, had settled in Ireland, and purchased a landed property in the Queen's county. There was a vein of talent that ran through the entire family in their several generations—serviceable to their country in some—agreeable in others—singular and eccentric in all. Henry was the author of some able pamphlets on the subject of Ireland, his work on Finance was good, and his History of the Penal Laws was deservedly praised. He was a member of the Imperial Parliament for a long period of time, and in 1841 was created a peer by the Whig party, under the title of Lord Congleton. Another son of Sir John's, was William; he was a man of taste and considerable ability, of whimsical talents, and passionately fond of the country, which his residence at Avondale, near

This proposal to dissolve Parliament was a very trying question to the ministry, for they had all along contended that the people were favourable to the Union. They resisted the motion with all their might, and denied the validity of the instance of Scotland, which was quoted, and also that of the English Revolution in 1688. This drew forth an able retort from Mr. Saurin, vindicating the conduct of those who had taken so meritorious and noble a part at that glorious period. He said—

Those great men who had assisted in the Revolution of 1688, had put down the slavish doctrine of passive obedience—they had declared that the king held his crown by compact with the people, and that when the crown violated that compact, by subverting, or attempting to subvert, the constitution, which was the guarantee of that people's liberty, the crown was forfeited, and the nation had a right to transfer the sovereign power to other hands. They had no notion of the doctrines which he was sorry to see now received—that the people were bound to submit to whatever that power thought proper to inflict upon them. At that day such a monstrous proposition as this would not have been tolerated, though now it began to raise its head and threaten the constitution. But he for one would not admit it. He would re-assert the doctrine of the glorious Revolution, and boldly declare, in the face of that House and of the nation, that when the sovereign power violated that compact which at the Revolution was declared to exist between the Government and the people, that moment the right of resisting that power accrues. Whether it would be prudent in the people to avail themselves of that right would be another question—but surely, if there be this right in the nation to resist an unconstitutional as-

the Vale of Avoca, contributed to increase, and the description of which can never be forgotten by any one who has read Mrs. Henry Tighe's poem, or Thomas Moore's melody. William sat for a short time in the Imperial Parliament, as member for the county of Wicklow; he, too, was attached to his country and to liberty; he was the author of several works, and his essay entitled "An Historical Apology for the Roman Catholics," got him just and great credit. On the whole, they were a race that deserve notice in the history of Ireland.

sumption of power which threatened the public liberty, there could not occur a stronger case for the exercise of it than this measure would afford if carried against the will of the majority of the nation. If a Legislative Union should be so forced upon this country against the will of its inhabitants, *it would be a nullity, and resistance to it would be a struggle against usurpation, and not a resistance against law.* You may make the Union binding as a law, but you cannot make it obligatory on conscience—*it will be obeyed as long as England is strong, but resistance to it will be, in the abstract, a duty, and the exhibition of that resistance will be a mere question of prudence.*

Sir Lawrence Parsons followed in the same strain, and pressed the Government severely. He boldly asserted that,

Posterity would never believe that the measure was sanctioned by the public approbation, if the proposal of the right honourable baronet was rejected, and if the noble lord attempted to carry the measure against the sense of the people, the consequence, sooner or later, must be a convulsion in this country, and a separation from Great Britain. Every country had its days of strength and days of weakness, and he remembered when England could enforce the obedience of this kingdom, but he had also seen that day pass by. A conquest was more difficult to maintain than to effect, and he would look upon the present measure, if carried against the sense of the people, but as a measure of conquest, and if the people submit, it will only be from prudence and not from choice.

On this debate Lord Castlereagh came forward more prominently than he had on former occasions, and, replying to Mr. Saurin, said, that while he acknowledged that he was a most able lawyer, he must say he appeared to be very young in politics; therefore he found it necessary to separate his legal from his political knowledge, and to say, that however his professional opinions may accord with the principles of the Constitution, his doctrines in the House were those of Tom Paine. The motion was strongly supported by Mr. W.

Ponsonby, Grattan, Egan, and Goold, but was rejected by 150 to 104. On the 19th, resolutions were carried, and a motion of Mr. O'Hara, that the chairman should leave the chair in order to put an end to the question, was lost by 112 to 134, majority 22.

On these occasions Mr. Grattan in vain exerted himself; he moved that the report of the committee should be read on Friday the 21st August, this was rejected by 154 to 107, and on the 25th of March the report of the committee in favour of the Union was brought up and passed.*

As if it were to guard against the dangers of a general election, and the expression of an opinion adverse to Government, Mr. John Claudius Beresford, though he professed to be a sincere opponent of the Union, introduced, on the 29th of March, a bill to prevent persons who had aided or assisted the late rebellion from voting for members of Parliament. This strange and unprecedented measure embraced both guilty and innocent, many individuals having been driven to take that step, and others having received protection and pardon. It was supported by Dr. Duigenan and Mr. Ogle, and was opposed by Sir Hercules Langrishe, who moved it to be read that day six months, which he carried by 33 to 13. The scope and object of this was to create terror and panic throughout the country, and to prevent any exertion on her behalf.

Another measure which was also resorted to, to lessen the power of the country, was proposed by Lord Castlereagh. He brought in a bill to enable the Government to accept of the services of the Irish militia, and he sent 5,000 of them to Eng-

* On the 27th of March Lord Castlereagh brought in a bill to legalize the vote of the Parliament of 1735, against the payment of the clergy of the tithe of agistment.

land; thus the English militia were sent into Ireland, and the Irish militia were sent out of it.

Another measure was the act of Indemnity, which was passed respecting Judkin Fitzgerald; this individual had made himself notorious for the cruelties he had practised, even with his own hands, during the times of the disturbances. On the 6th April, Lord Mathew presented a petition from him praying to be indemnified for acts done during the time of the rebellion. This was in consequence of a verdict which had been given against him in the case of a person of the name of Wright, a French teacher, in whose pocket he had found a letter written in that language, and in consequence of which Judkin Fitzgerald, who could not read French, had flogged him most unmercifully. Toler, the Attorney-General, moved that the petition be referred to a Secret Committee, which was opposed by Plunket, Brown, Edgeworth, Hutchinson, Yelverton; the disgraceful bill, after considerable debating, was passed by 65 to 14 voices, and the House adjourned to the 10th of April.

In the House of Lords the measure found little opposition; the message in favour of a Union was delivered by Lord Clare on the 10th of February, and was carried by 75 to 26. It was supported by Lord Donoughmore on the ground that the Roman Catholics would receive justice in an United Parliament, where their claims would be temperately discussed and finally conceded. Lord Clare rested his main objection to an Irish Parliament on the question of Regency, and on the religious animosities which existed, destroying all social happiness and threatening the country with endless contests. His speech was a sort of Irish history, a collection of her calamities and civil broils, distressing to hear, and delivered with a

discreditable purpose, full of misstatement, misrepresentation, and calumny; abusing the Irish, assailing the Catholics, flattering the English, and aspersing the brightest passages of Irish history; he attacked Lord Downshire and Lord Charlemont for the letter they had issued, and he inveighed against Mr. Grattan and the party with whom he had acted; this ill-judged and censurable display was published in a pamphlet of upwards of 100 pages.

Mr. Grattan having been so pointedly alluded to, thought proper to reply to it, and he did so in one of his ablest and best productions;* he defended the character of his countrymen, exposed the unjust charges brought against them, and drew a most interesting and eloquent description of his early friends, in a manner that does justice to their memory, and deserves to be recorded to their latest posterity. The subjoined is an extract:—

Mr. Malone, Lord Pery, late Lord Shannon, Duke of Leinster, the Mr. Ponsonbys, Mr. Brownlow, Sir William Osborne, Mr. Burgh, Mr. Daly, Mr. Yelverton, Mr. Ogle, Mr. Flood, Mr. Forbes, Lord Charlemont, and myself; I follow the author through the graves of these honourable dead men, for most of them are so; and I beg to raise up their tombstones, as he throws them down; I feel it more instructive to converse with their ashes, than with his compositions.

Mr. Malone, one of the characters of '53, was a man of the finest intellect that any country ever produced. "The three ablest men I have ever heard, were Mr. Pitt (the father), Mr. Murray, and Mr. Malone; for a popular assembly I would choose Mr. Pitt; for a privy council, Murray; for twelve wise men, Malone." This was the opinion which Lord Sackville, the secretary of '53, gave of Mr. Malone to a gentleman from whom I heard it. "He is a great sea in a calm," said Mr. Gerrard Hamil-

* It will be found in the volume of Mr. Grattan's Miscellaneous Works, page 96, collected by the author; also in D. Madden's select speeches of Grattan in the appendix.

ton, another great judge of men and talents; "Aye," it was replied, "but had you seen him when he was young, you would have said he was a great sea in a storm;" and like the sea, whether in calm or storm, he was a great production of nature.

Lord Pery, he is not yet canonized by death; but he, like the rest, has been canonized by slander. He was more or less a party in all those measures which the pamphlet condemns, and indeed in every great statute and measure that took place in Ireland for the last fifty years; a man of the most legislative capacity I ever knew, and the most comprehensive reach of understanding I ever saw; with a deep engraven impression of public care, accompanied by a temper which was tranquillity itself, and a personal firmness that was adamant; in his train, is every private virtue that can adorn human nature.

Mr. Brownlow, Sir William Osborne, I wish we had more of these criminals; the former seconded the address of '82; and in the latter and in both, there was a station of mind that would have become the proudest senate in Europe.

Mr. Flood, my rival, as the pamphlet calls him—and I should be unworthy the character of his rival, if in his grave I did not do him justice—he had his faults, but he had great powers; great public effect; he persuaded the old, he inspired the young; the Castle vanished before him; on a small subject he was miserable; put into his hand a distaff, and, like Hercules, he made sad work of it; but give him the thunderbolt, and he had the arm of a Jupiter; he misjudged when he transferred himself to the English Parliament; he forgot that he was a tree of the forest, too old and too great to be transplanted at fifty;* and his seat in the British Parliament is a caution to the friends of Union to stay at home, and make the country of their birth the seat of their action.

Mr. Burgh, another great person in those scenes, which it is not in the little quill of this author to depreciate. He was a man singularly gifted—with great talent; great variety; wit, oratory, and logic; he too had his weakness; —but he had the pride of genius also; and strove to raise his country along with himself; and never sought to build his elevation on the degradation of Ireland.

* Mr. Grattan was an exception to his own rule, being fifty-nine when he entered the Imperial Parliament.

I moved an amendment for a free export; he moved a better amendment, and he lost his place; I moved a declaration of right; "with my last breath will I support the right of the Irish Parliament," was his note to me when I applied to him for his support; he lost the chance of recovering his place, and his way to the seals, for which he might have bartered. The gates of promotion were shut on him, as those of glory opened.

Mr. Daly, my beloved friend—he, in a great measure, drew the address of '79, in favour of our trade; that "ungracious measure;" and he saw, read, and approved of the address of '82, in favour of constitution; that address of "separation;" he visited me in my illness, at that moment, and I had communication on those subjects with that man, whose powers of oratory were next to perfection; and whose powers of understanding, I might say, from what has lately happened, bordered on the spirit of prophecy.*

Mr. Forbes, a name I shall ever regard, and a death I shall ever deplore—enlightened, sensible, laborious, and useful—proud in poverty, and patriotic, he preferred exile to apostacy, and met his death. I speak of the dead, I say nothing of the living, but that I attribute to this constellation of men, in a great measure, the privileges of your country; and I attribute such a generation of men to the residence of your Parliament.

The ministers of the crown, who, in the times related by the pamphlet, did the king's business, were respectable and able men; they supported sometimes acts of power, but they never, by any shocking declaration, outraged the constitution; they adjusted themselves to the idea of liberty, even when they might have offended against the principle, and always kept on terms of decency with the people and their privileges; least of all did they indulge in a termagant vulgarity, debasing, to a plebeian level, courts and senates, and mortgaging Irish infamy on a speculation of British promotion.

In the list of injured characters, I beg leave to say a few words for the good and gracious Earl of Charlemont; an attack not only on his measures, but on his representative,

* This alludes to a dinner party in Mr. Hobart's time, when Lord Clare *grew gay*, and declaimed violently against the Union. After he left the company, Daly said, "*That little fellow would vote for it to-morrow.*"

makes his vindication seasonable; formed to unite aristocracy and the people, with the manners of a court and the principles of a patriot, with the flame of liberty and the love of order, unassailable to the approaches of power, of profit, or of titles, he annexed to the love of freedom a veneration for order, and cast on the crowd that followed him the gracious shade of his own accomplishments, so that the very rabble grew civilised as it approached his person; for years did he preside over a great army without pay or reward; and he helped to accomplish a great revolution, without a drop of blood.

Let slaves utter their slander, and bark at glory which is conferred by the people; his name will stand;—and when their clay shall be gathered to the dirt to which they belong, his monument, whether in marble, or in the hearts of his countrymen, shall be consulted as a subject of sorrow, and a source of virtue.

Should the author of the pamphlet pray, he could not ask for his son a greater blessing than to resemble the good Earl of Charlemont; nor could that son repay that blessing by any act of gratitude more filial, than by committing to the flames his father's publications.*

* The character of Mr. Yelverton was here omitted; perhaps the Union, that blot upon his fame, was the cause. Mr. Grattan however, did not forget him, and long after the passions of the day had passed, he alluded to his countryman in the following remarkable manner, in the debate on the Roman Catholic question, on the 25th of May, 1808, alluding to the penal code, Mr. Grattan said, "It was detailed by the late Lord Avonmore—I heard him—his speech was the whole of the subject, and a concatenated and inspired argument not to be resisted; it was the march of an elephant, it was the wave of the Atlantic, a column of water three thousand miles deep. He began with the Catholic at his birth, he followed him to his grave; he showed that in every period he was harassed by the law—the law stood at his cradle, it stood at his bridal bed, and it stood at his coffin."

The speech that Mr. Grattan here eulogizes was made by Mr. Yelverton in favour of the Catholics in 1782, when the laws were relaxed; no trace of it remains.

CHAPTER V.

Proceedings in the British Parliament on the Union.—Sheridan's exertions against it.—Lord Downshire on the offers to him from Government.—Lord Camden on the torture in Ireland.—Description of the Government supporters in the Irish Parliament in the Lower House.—St. George Daly, William Smith, Luke Fox, Robert Johnson, all created judges for their votes.—Society of the Monks of the Screw.—Dr. Frederick Jebb.—Johnson promoted.—Curran's great eulogium on Lord Avonmore.—Anecdote of him by Curran.—Dr. Arthur Browne killed by the Union.—In the upper House, Lord Pery, Lord Carleton, Lord Kilwarden, Lord Avonmore.—Anecdote of, by Curran.—His last speech in the House alluding to Mr. Grattan.—Lord Castlereagh.—His character and conduct.—Motion of Mr. O'Donnell that the placemen should go to the Lord Lieutenant with the address on the Union.—List of them.—Union Bill read a second time.—Mr. Grattan's speech.—Encomium on him by Mr. Burrowes.—Motion that the Union Bill be burned.—Bill passed the 7th of June.—Receives the Royal Assent on the 1st of August.—Speeches against the Union bought by Lord Castlereagh and burned.

The proceedings in the British Parliament merit attention. In the preceding year both Houses had voted an address to his Majesty recommending a Union, and, in 1800, the subject was again brought forward by Mr. Pitt, who carried his resolutions in favour of the Union. On the 11th of April Lord Grenville moved an address to the King, approving of these resolutions, and praying that they should be transmitted to the Parliament of Ireland. This was seconded by Lord Auckland (Mr. Eden) and passed; and on the 21st of April, Mr. Pitt moved and carried the question for a committee on the subject. It was opposed by Mr. Sheridan,* Doctor Lawrence, and Mr.

* During this struggle Sheridan displayed great boldness, spirit, and national feeling; he brought forward motion after motion in behalf of his

(afterwards Lord) Grey, who proposed an address to his Majesty, urging that all proceedings might be suspended until the sentiments of the Irish people upon the subject had been ascertained. This was lost on division by 30 to 206. On the 21st of April Lord Grenville proposed a similar committee in the Lords, in which he moved the three first articles of Union. On a division there were 82 for, and only three against his motion—Lords Derby, Holland, and King. On the 22nd, Mr. Pitt, after reading a letter of the Duke of Portland's in 1782, by which he sought to prove that the settlement of '82 was not final, moved that the House should concur with the Lords' address on the subject of the Union. Mr. Douglas (afterwards Lord Glenbervie) made a long speech in support of it. Sir Francis Burdett opposed it,—he said that one individual (Mr. Fox) had been driven in despair from the councils of the kingdom, to whom alone the Irish would have listened. Colonel FitzPatrick asserted (from his own knowledge, as he had been secretary in Ireland at the time) that the letter of the Duke of Portland's, read by Mr. Pitt, was not a public paper, but a private note of his own, written without concert with any of his council, and had reference merely to commercial arrangements (this was the fact). The motion was agreed to.

Such were the proceedings of the British Parliament, whose right to interfere with the affairs of Ireland Mr. Pitt had, on former occasions,

country, in opposition to Mr. Pitt, but he met with little support; he was arguing against the interests of the audience he addressed, and against the feelings of the people among whom he lived. The love of gain and the love of power were the principles he had to combat, and the result may be easily imagined; all his propositions on behalf of Ireland were unsuccessful; but his conduct did him honour, and the event has justified his foresight, for after the lapse of near half a century, the increasing hostility to the Union and its complete failure have confirmed his predictions and refuted those of Mr. Pitt.

strongly denied. In 1797 and 1798, he maintained that Ireland was a free and independent nation, and that England could not, with propriety, and ought not, to interpose in any way in her concerns. At the period of the disturbances, consequent on the cruelties practised in that country, a motion had been made by Lord Moira, on behalf it may be said of humanity, when he and other humane individuals strove by English help to stop the effusion of blood,* Mr. Pitt and his party asserted that the British Parliament had no right to interpose—then it was that the voice, as well as the arm, of Britain was stayed, and could not be raised in order to rescue the suffering Irish from the lash, the torture, and the triangle: she was powerless then, and could not protect the humble mansion of the Irish peasant from the violations committed by the legal robber,† the furious Orangeman, the midnight assailant. British mercy was then deaf to Irish sufferings, Irish injury, and Irish insult. But when it became an object to destroy a constitution which, by treaty, England was bound to uphold, then the right, the power, the necessity, for British interference arose, and where virtue had been deaf before and humanity dormant—interest and ambition now prevailed, and even vice lost all her deformity. But, in sooth, the non-interference in 1798 and 1799 was a delusion. The chief gover-

* When Lord Grenville, on the 19th of March, brought forward resolutions on the subject of the Union, he was opposed by Lords Fitzwilliam and Moira, who stated that the whipping and torturing practised in Ireland had driven the people into rebellion. Lord Camden defended his Government, and denied that *unnecessary excesses* were committed, but used these remarkable expressions, "*that the measures of the Government had caused the rebellion to break out sooner than it otherwise would.*"

† Read "*Bryan Byrne of Glenmalure,*" a heart-rending little poem by Mrs. Henry Tighe. The *facts* were related to John Blachford, her brother. Pysche, p. 281, 3rd edition.

nors of Ireland, and the military authorities, were nominees and creatures of the English ministers: the Peers and Commons, who passed the laws which encouraged and indemnified the crimes of which Lord Moira complained, were English servitors or English pensioners — neither representing Irish feelings, nor elected by the Irish people. The legalised abominations of '98 were the fruits of English interference, though using Irish tools; for every thing but humanity and justice England's Minister had interfered in 1798.*

Few of the supporters of Government were men of talent. The ablest was St. George Daly:† he was brother to the celebrated Denis Daly who had acted a noble part in 1782. In some degree he resembled him, but was of a coarser clay: he made the best speech in favour of the Union, and showed that he was of the same blood. He was distinguished when a member of the University of Dublin, by his application and ability: his understanding was strong: he was conversant with books, and not devoid of some powers of reasoning, but was of a retired habit and unpopular manners. Though he succeeded Mr. Fitzgerald as prime sergeant, yet he had no excuse in voting for the Union. He had a name—and he sold it: other

* In the debate on the 8th of May, Lord Downshire, who had a seat in the Parliament of both countries, said, that many offers and inducements were held out to him in order to gain his assent to the measure; but he scorned the offers as much as he laughed at the tyrannical injustice which he had suffered for his perseverance. Since 1782 Ireland had increased in wealth, and made great improvements. Government were bringing about, not a Union, but a Revolution; it would produce distraction, discontent, rebellion, and ultimately separation.

Two very lucrative offices in the Law Courts, which were settled in reversion on the Downshire family, were taken from them and given to Yelverton for supporting the Union. His name was erased from the Privy Council, he was removed from the Governorship of the county, he was deprived of the command of the Downshire Militia, and he was displaced from the office of Registrar in the Court of Chancery.

† He was appointed one of the judges of the King's Bench.

men had nothing—but he had everything to support—he had character: others had none, but he came to market with the splendid inheritance of good fortune and of great fame.

William Smith was son of the Master of the Rolls, he could write but could not speak, he had a sour mind that could produce nothing, but he listened, and, unable to reply in the House, he retired to his chamber to brood over the subject, and, in a month after, produced a closely written pamphlet in reply to Mr. * * *, and Mr. * * *, and Mr. * * *'s speech on the Union, which he got printed and published at the expense of the Government. He did not exactly state what was malicious, but put it in such a manner as to let it state itself. He was full of caprice, his manner was pert, his mind was weak, and active only by corrosion. He was a mixture of honey and vinegar. He had a sort of wormishness about him, and possessed much of the qualities of a serpent. He was never found guilty of uttering a good principle, but what he said, he affected to put in the form of a syllogism and of logic—the only thing he was liberal of, was his pen*—but his endless writings produced no impression: it was the glow-worm's ineffectual fire—pale, cold, and weak.†

Mr. Luke Fox's‡ conduct was indefensible, he violated public and private duty, deserted his patron, abandoned his country, and, at the critical moment, suffered the scale to be turned against her at the expense of his honour and his vote. He was a coarse and clever lawyer, a strong mind that grasped the point, and took a firm hold of

* At the end of his life he published a work called the *Mase*, a collection of poems and trifles, that certainly deserved the *name* he gave it, for it surprised all his friends by its childishness.

† He regretted that he had voted for the Union, and in private stated so. He was appointed one of the Barons of the Exchequer.

‡ He was appointed one of the Judges of the Common Pleas.

what he had in view, but free from public principle, public honour, or public spirit of any kind whatever.

Robert Johnson commenced his public life with credit, almost with celebrity; he wrote in defence of the people and of the rights of Ireland, and he did so with boldness and with truth. There appeared, in 1779, under the signature of Guatimozin, several letters, written in support of the armed volunteer associations, and the use of Irish manufacture, published in the *Freeman's Journal;* these were reprinted in London, and went through several editions. Another series then appeared, under the title of Causidicus, in reply to judge Blackstone's doctrine on the Law of Conquest over Ireland. They entered into the consideration of the various laws enacted in England against Ireland, and into the causes of Ireland's distress and poverty. These works were conceived with spirit, written with ability, and met with complete success.* They deserved their fame, for they were clear, argumentative, and bold. The title of the first work was taken from Robertson's History of

* In them occurs the often quoted passage: "Look to the word 'penalty' or the word 'Ireland,' 'tis equal which, for you may track Ireland through the statute-book, as you do a wounded man through a crowd—by blood."

He was one of the members of the society of St. Patrick or the Monks of the Screw. He often related to the author the extreme pleasure he met with in that meeting, when Lord Charlemont, Messrs. Daly, Yelverton, Burgh, Hardy, Grattan, Curran, Dr. Frederick Jebb, and many more of that party, were in the habit of assembling to arrange matters for debate in Parliament, for public proceedings and political tracts. He said, that he and Dr. Jebb had written Guatimozin and Causidicus. A short time after, Dr. Jebb was detached from the society, and solicited by Government to reply to a pamphlet of Mr. Grattan's against the Perpetual Mutiny Bill. After he had written the reply, which was not bad, some point and good personal attack, he got a pension of 300*l.* a year for his services; he then went to Mr. Grattan, related the circumstance, and added that he had got the pension, *but that the pamphlet could not be answered.* For the names of the members, and a fuller account of this society, see the interesting and ably written Memoirs of Curran, by his son, second edition, Edinburgh, vol. iii. p. 122.

America, where, in describing the contest between the Spaniards and the Mexicans, he says—"Guatimozin continued to defend his capital with obstinate resolution and disputed every inch of ground. He rejected with scorn every overture from the Cortes, and, disdaining the idea of submitting to the oppressors of his country, determined not to survive its ruin." This passage, Robert Johnson used to repeat with great admiration, and seemed to glory in it as if it was not only his selection but composition. Yet these noble sentiments, so aptly quoted by him, were, unfortunately for his fame, totally obliterated from his memory in 1800. He listened to the overtures from the *British Cortes*, he did not defend his capital, but submitted to those whom he had in early life called the oppressors of his country. He seemed to complain of Lord Cornwallis for misrepresenting to him the sentiments of the Catholics, and thereby severing the *Gordian knot* that bound together the party of which he was a member, and who arrogated to themselves the power of turning the balance for or against the Union. Unfortunately, however, for Mr. Johnson's fame, the means used to effect this purpose was not with iron but with gold. Johnson, by voting for the Union, got a seat upon the bench,* and sacrificed his reputation; but even with this, he was not satisfied—he sought farther remuneration, and asked to get the salary of judge from the time the promise was made (perhaps the day he voted for the Union). This was refused by Government, unless he agreed to sign a paper in which he set forth his demand: considering this too bad he declined to comply. Vexed, irritated, and disgusted, he assailed the Government on the subject of Emmett's Insurrection, and published

* He was appointed Judge of the Common Pleas, as was also, at a later period, his relation, William, one of those who, at the meeting of the bar in 1798, had supported the proposition of a Union.

several letters under the signature of Juverna, in Cobbett's *Register* of November, 1803—he was given up by Cobbett—prosecuted by Government—found guilty, arrested in Ireland, and about to be hurried off like a common felon to Great Britain, under an Act of Parliament passed subsequent to the publication, and it might be said almost for the purpose of meeting this case. The law proceedings of England were procrastinated by legal steps taken in the Irish Courts, which, in February 1805, gave Mr. Curran an opportunity of making, on behalf of Johnson,* one of his most eloquent and talented displays.

* The passage from Mr. Curran's speech which is here submitted to the reader has been much admired and much criticised, some have censured it as inapplicable, and therefore injudiciously introduced; but it must be admitted that it is full of beauty and sentiment. Mr. Curran often alluded to it, and used to say—

"Yelverton cried like a child at the judgment in Johnson's case. I "thought to move him by the recollection of those private scenes. I "thought he would have been melted down, and that by bringing to "his mind a view of former times, when we were both honest, both "good; that he would have been led to give a spirited decision. I "was much interested, for I really wished that poor Avonmore would "have decided as I think he ought, and have done the country that "justice that I am confident was due. He met me afterwards in the "chamber, and throwing his arms around me, exclaimed, 'I am glad "'to see you—you affected me greatly, and I am sure you felt what "'you said—for my part the reconciliation is complete.'"

"I am not ignorant, my lords, that this extraordinary construction has received the sanction of another court, nor of the surprise and dismay with which it smote upon the general heart of the bar. I am aware that I may have the mortification of being told in another country of that unhappy decision, and I foresee in what confusion I shall hang down my head when I am told it. But I cherish, too, the consolatory hope, that I shall be able to tell them that I had an old and learned friend, whom I would put above all the sweepings of their hall, who was of a different opinion; who had derived his ideas of civil liberty from the purest fountains of Athens and Rome; who had fed the youthful vigour of his studious mind with the theoretic knowledge of their wisest philosophers and statesmen; and who had refined the theory into the quick and exquisite sensibility of moral instinct, by contemplating the practice of their most illustrious examples; by dwelling on the sweet souled piety of Cimon, on the anticipated christianity of Socrates, on the gallant and pathetic patriotism of Epaminondas, on that pure austerity of Fabricius, whom to move from his integrity would have been more difficult than to have pushed the sun from his course, I

The case was one of considerable hardship. The grand jury of Middlesex found a true bill, and Lord Ellenborough thereupon issued his warrant to arrest the judge and bring him to England to give bail and stand his trial. This warrant was endorsed by a justice of the peace in Ireland, and Johnson was arrested. A writ of habeas corpus was immediately sued out, and seven judges assisted the chief justice in the case—three were for discharging him, three for remanding him, two did not give any opinion; the case was referred to the King's Bench—two were for remanding him, and Judge Day for discharging him. A new writ issued, returnable to the Exchequer—the case was argued for three days—Baron Smith alone was for his discharge. He was in consequence remanded, and the subject was brought before the Imperial Parliament; but the only remedy afforded was the passing a bill to compel witnesses to attend in England. He petitioned the House of Lords, complaining of the *ex post facto* law which was passed after the alleged

would add, that if he had seemed to hesitate, it was but for a moment; that his hesitation was like the passing cloud that floats across the morning sun, and hides it from the view, and does so for a moment hide it by involving the spectator without even approaching the face of the luminary: and this soothing hope I draw from the dearest and tenderest recollections of my life, from the remembrance of those attic nights and those refections of the gods which we have spent with those admired and respected and beloved companions who have gone before us; over whose ashes the most precious tears of Ireland have been shed: yes, my good lord, I see you do not forget them, I see their sacred forms passing in sad review before your memory; I see your pained and softened fancy recalling those happy meetings, when the innocent enjoyment of social mirth, expanded into the nobler warmth of social virtue; and the horizon of the board became enlarged into the horizon of man; when the swelling heart conceived and communicated the pure and generous purpose, when my slender and younger taper imbibed its borrowed light from the more matured and redundant fountain of yours. Yes, my lord, we can remember those nights without any other regret than that they can never more return, for

"We spent them not in toys, or lust or wine;
But search of deep philosophy,
Wit, eloquence, and poesy,
Arts, which I lov'd, for they, my friend, were thine."

libel was published, but Lord Eldon (the Chancellor) would grant no other relief except his assent to the bill. The action was tried in England, in November, 1805, and turned on a question of handwriting—four witnesses swore the paper was in the handwriting of the judge, five witnesses swore it was not, the English jury believed the four, disbelieved the five, and found Johnson guilty. It afterwards appeared they were wrong, as the writing was not that of the Judge, but of his daughter, a talented and spirited lady, who, in consequence, was known ever after by the name of *Juverna*. On the whole it was an oppressive and tyrannical proceeding, and did not lead Johnson to fall more in love with the Union he had voted, but rather led him to think that the men he had sold his country to were most unrelenting taskmasters. However, in Trinity term 1806, a *noli prosequi* was entered on the record, the Judge was permitted to retire from the Bench on a pension for life, and in that retirement he ended those days that were brighter at their commencement than at their close. He seemed to regret his conduct at the Union, but he was too proud openly to confess it.

Doctor Arthur Browne was the most gentlemanlike of all that party, he had spoken and voted against the Union in 1799, but in 1800 he changed sides and joined with those who supported it. If he had any apology for selling the country, it was that he did not belong to her—for he was was not an Irishman. Yet he should have been attached to liberty—for he was an American. He was member for the University of Dublin: he was a man of taste and acquirements, and a lover of literature. As a speaker he was not deficient: he possessed a degree of ease and elegance of manner as well as mind, but he received his reward, for

he fell a victim to his vote. He found that the office he accepted was no compensation for his loss of honour: he repented his conduct, but his regret came too late, and he died of a broken heart.*

The rest were mercenaries, soldiers, bravoes, or bullies.

In the upper House, Ireland could number few supporters. Lord Perry still lived, and to the last upheld the character with which he began life, and preserved, undiminished, his affection for his country—but age and infirmity had incapacitated his body, though not his mind. "I never will give my assent to a measure which seals the ruin of my country. I am at present in a bad state of health, and, should I continue so, and the measure be brought forward, I shall have myself carried in a litter to the House, there to give it every opposition in my power." These were his words—noble words!—worthy of the Greek and Roman name.

But Lord Clare still remained—still ruled the House—talkative, bold, and imperious.

Lord Carleton† was miserable, feeble, and timid, though civil and gentlemanlike; he had read some books, and he strove to give his speech at the Union the form of an argument, in order that some persons might imagine that he could reason; but his production was like his mind—weakness personified. He showed great sharpness at the

* He was well acquainted with Mr. Grattan, and used to visit Tinnehinch, but he forfeited the regard that Mr. Grattan entertained towards him. Their acquaintance, however, continued.

† See the anecdote of Curran, *ante*, vol. iii. page 422.

He was superannuated and *allowed to retire on a pension*, he went to England, and for a number of years lived in London in the greatest gaiety and in excellent health; thus it was not only the money levied off the people and paid down at the time that was a charge on the state, but these bribes were a heavier tax on the people and of longer duration; some pensions were for life, others in expectancy, in promise, or in reversion.

state trials: he was cool and collected, and not influenced by the fury and passion of the times—but he was by his fears. He was a poor character: his argument was that the Commons had no power over the representatives—that a supreme power must exist somewhere. The third Estate he assumed to be the House of Commons, and not the Commons, and that the latter had no power, but gave up all (by that election) over those whom they elected. And this monstrous ignorance Carleton put forward and recommended by an appearance of knowledge.

Arthur Wolfe (Lord Kilwarden) was the son of a distinguished conveyancer in Dublin, who was patronised by the leading citizens and the corporation, got much business, and was brought forward through their means. He used to say that the House of Commons was too corrupt a place for him to enter, and that every man there was a rogue—so he sent in his son.

Arthur had never applied his mind to politics, and could not even understand a political question. He was not deficient as a lawyer: he spoke with ability and was a sensible man, amiable in private and of a kind disposition, a mild and inoffensive character, grave and moral, but destitute of public principle, or popular tendencies, and without any pretension to eloquence. His defence of the doctrine of fiats and the practice of holding persons to excessive bail, as exercised by Lord Clonmell in 1790, injured his reputation as a constitutional lawyer, and did not raise his character as an advocate. He spoke, however, rather in mitigation than in defence, and seemed more to doubt than to decide, and it was this weak exhibition which drew from Mr. Ponsonby the galling remark—"that he was a very worthy man, but a miserable attorney-general." As Crown Prose-

cutor he was not considered harsh, and as a judge he was considered mild, and was certainly honest —but as a member of Parliament he was an invariable supporter of every measure of the Court. His office gave him some importance in the lower House, but in the upper he was nothing. He thought he would tranquillize every thing by the Union; and that if Parliament was put down it would facilitate the working of Government, and because Parliament had opposed the jobs of the Court, and because he professed to love the constitution, he put down the Parliament. He is another proof that the possession of power is fatal to a weak man.

Wolfe was a man who did mischief to nothing but his country. He succeeded Lord Carleton as solicitor-general in 1787, Lord Clare as attorney-general in 1789, and Lord Clonmell as chief justice in 1798. His death was melancholy, and his humane disposition, evinced in his last and most trying moment, endears his memory. Mortally wounded by his assassins in 1803, he raised his head and exclaimed—"Let no man suffer for my death but on a fair trial, and by the laws of his country"—a noble and humane expression, though too lawyerly to be quite heroic.

Lord Avonmore had sold his fame, and tarnished the lustre of his early life. For supporting the Union he got, for his relations, the places that were taken from the Downshire family for opposing it; he had spoken admirably for the catholics in 1778, but no trace of his speech remains. He acted well at the period of the volunteers—well in '80—well in '82—well on Poynings law; but he did not tell the truth when he said, in 1800, that he had the Union in his mind in 1782. It was no such thing, he never mentioned the subject, he did not even dream of it, and if he had,

he would not have dared to utter such mischievous folly. Mr. Grattan knew the entire party, and directed their proceedings, and no idea of the sort was ever stated—it would not have been tolerated for an instant. These idle visions were reserved for the insincerity of the Duke of Portland, and the "*bonnie*" servility of Mr. William Ogilvie.*

Lord Avonmore was driven by the minister, and in fact was afraid of him. He had not boldness to stand up against Lord Clare, in the case of Pamela and Edward Fitzgerald—he was completely cowed. Mr. Curran, who was their counsel against the bill then before the Lords, applied to Lord Avonmore, and during the argument, went behind the throne to converse with him on the subject, but he in vain sought to rouse his feelings and his spirit; and though Avonmore knew that Lord Clare was wrong as to the law in the case of the attainder,† yet he was afraid to say so, or express, even on a point of law, a different opinion.

The speech that he made in favour of the Union has nothing in it. No trace of 1782—the lamp that burned so brightly then was now no more; and all that can be said is, that when it became extinct, it did not become offensive; it cast a pale and flickering gleam around—then sunk for ever. But even his flattering compliment to his early friend (Mr. Grattan)‡ can, for

* See vol. ii. page 284, where Mr. Ogilvie's conduct is mentioned; he was a shrewd Scotchman, who strove to whisper about a Union in '82; but the union he valued *most*, was that with the Duchess of Leinster, in which, to the surprise of every one, he ultimately succeeded.

† The attainder was reversed many years afterwards by the Liverpool (1819) Administration, and its illegality was a matter of astonishment to the lawyers of the day.—See *ante*.

‡ The following was the allusion that he made to Mr. Grattan: "I have lived to see an illustrious friend of mine at one time idolized as a deity, and at another disfranchised as a traitor; the act of an intemperate corporation whose censure could no more depreciate, than their

such a character, afford but a poor apology. This speech, which was such a bitter reflection on his splendid name, his former services, and all his ancient glories, he was actually compelled by the minister to print and publish. He submitted to the ignominy, though not without reluctance, and, as Curran somewhat coarsely but truly said, when alluding to this circumstance—"*Oh! poor Yelverton! he was forced to go to market with his bastard in his arms.*"

Throughout these pages enough has already been said of Lord Castlereagh,—still it may be of service to posterity, as well as a caution to those who come after, if his character is summed up in a few words more. It may be added that he was a corrupt man and a most profligate minister, devoid of any political principle whatever. He was cold-blooded, cruel, false, and hollow. He must have heard the lash and seen the triangles, but he shut his eyes, and closed his ears, and let the bloody work go on, and the backs of his fellow-countrymen quiver beneath the torture. He had no heart—he had no humanity: and as he sat within the Castle Walls, his mind could brood on nothing but the mischief he meditated for his country. He abandoned his early principles—he deserted his early friends—he arrested and im-

applause could enhance, the value of a character which will always sustain itself. I have lived, and am proud to say it, in habits of intimacy with him; and know him to be as incapable of engaging in any plan for separating this country from Great Britain, as the most strenuous advocate for the present measure. If there be any young man within hearing, who feels himself enamoured of popularity, I shall beg leave to give him a short lesson of instruction. Let him keep himself for ever engaged in the pursuit of some unattainable object; let him make the impracticability of his measures the foundation of his fame; but let him beware how he follows any solid or possible good, for as sure as he succeeds his fame is d——d for ever. Success will only call up some envious swaggerer who will undertake to go a bar's length beyond him, and snatch away from him the worthless prize of popular estimation." These were the last words of Lord Baron Yelverton in the House of Lords in Ireland.

prisoned his ablest supporter: all his popular airs were assumed, he never felt them, nor did he ever, either in public or private, express or betray a single popular sentiment. He was brought up in England, and bred a cold politician: he was a man of business, and so far he was able, but he never did, or was capable of doing, a great act. He was just suited for the lower stage of politics, and in that he excelled and gained credit, for the inferior line is often of more apparent use than the higher. He was afflicted with an itchy desire to be impertinent, and he only spoke well when he had his friends about him, a large army at his back, and a broken-down insurrection in his front. He had a clear head, and could state the properties and balance of things well; he possessed also a power of attack, and had a personal and gentlemanlike satire, but he had no luminous ideas and never enlightened a subject: his sentences were endless; tropes without form or figure, or imagination, or prosody, or grammar. But what countervailed with Pitt all his defects, and rendered him a strong implement of oppression, was his indomitable, unsurpassed, inscrutable resolution.

In 1790, he became acquainted with the popular party in the north of Ireland; amongst them was Samuel Neilson, who possessed a good deal of influence there, and who conducted the *Northern Star*, a paper of republican principles. On the 16th April in that year (the anniversary of the independence of Ireland in 1782), he attended the great Whig club dinner at Belfast, with Dr. Halliday, Lord Londonderry, and others of that party; he drank their popular toasts, some of those of the United Irishmen, and availed himself of all these circumstances, these men, and their politics to get into Parliament.

Yet afterwards, in 1799, he went with Mr. Pollock, Lord Downshire, and a large party, to arrest this Neilson, his former acquaintance and his chief supporter, and cast him into prison, where he remained for upwards of fourteen months without charge, without accusation, without trial, —injured his health, impaired his character, destroyed his fortune,* and finally, was the means of costing him not only his liberty but his life. Having abandoned his friends, and played this treacherous and infamous part, Castlereagh began the trade of bribery. So early as 1796, he had tried to gain over Mr. Hardy: he requested of Mr. Berwick, with whom he was acquainted, to communicate to Mr. Hardy, that if he would agree not to speak or to vote for the Roman Catholic question, he would get a considerable situation under Government. Berwick replied that such a thing was impossible; that Hardy would never listen to such a proposal; and besides, he was a great friend of Lord Granard, who was in opposition. Castlereagh then said—"Let him vote with Lord Granard on all other questions, but let him remain quiet on the Roman Catholic!!!" Berwick being thus pressed, related the conversation to Hardy, who at once revolted at it, and spurned the proposal. He tried this corrupt office in the north, *and was actually turned out of Sir John Blackwood's house for offering to bribe him.*† The same disgrace befel him in the residence of another equally spirited individual in the same county.‡ In the year 1799, he showed considerable stoutness, and replied fiercely to George Ponsonby; however, he

* See Dr. Madden's *United Irishmen*, vol. i. second series.

† See *ante*, vol. iv. page 432; the anecdote is related by the Blackwood family.

‡ Supposed to be Mr. Savage or Mr. Ford.

found it easier to bribe than to bully, and in the next year he was milder. In 1800, when Mr. Grattan returned to Parliament, Lord Castlereagh alluded to him, and Mr. Grattan replied rather sharply, contrasting his conduct then with what it had been in early times; he read the toasts and sentiments that he had expressed in the county of Down, and pressed him sorely for having deserted his principles: the other replied, that "as to any thing personal, he would not take notice of it in the House;" yet he did not take notice of it out of the House, nor did he ever come forth in any way, but remained passive under the rebuke; however, it must be admitted that he was not devoid of personal courage. Before the Union, he negotiated with the Catholics, thinking them fit to be admitted into Parliament, and he afterwards opposed them,—thus, he used Emancipation as a means to obtain the Union, and, having passed the Union, he cheated the Catholics out of it.

When he went to England,* he displayed courage in the personal affair with Mr. Canning. When he went to the Congress at Vienna, he found the business beyond his capacity, and was quite unequal to the situation; he could scarcely speak the French language; had he been an able man, he could have obtained great commercial advantages for England, and better terms for the people of the Continent; he would have procured the abolition of the slave trade, instead of leaving it unnoticed in the treaty with France, and to be purchased by a sum of money from the Court of Spain. Had Lord Chatham or Mr. Fox been there, it would have been different. He got credit at Court for servile obedience to the Crown, and became Minister because he fell into the track of

* The English cannot forget that memorable phrase, "THE IGNORANT IMPATIENCE OF TAXATION."

Mr. Pitt's politics, that happened to be successful. The greatest reflection on his political opponents was, that such a man could become popular, and the greatest disgrace to the age was, that a country like England should have been defended by such a character. But Providence, inscrutable in her ways, and wise in all her works, reserved him for a lasting example to mankind. This man commenced his career by taking away the lives of his fellow countrymen—he concluded it by taking away his own; and with his own hand he terminated his existence* and avenged his country.

The proceedings respecting the Union now drew quickly to a close. On the 21st May the resolutions were reported to the House, and Lord Castlereagh moved to bring in the Union Bill. This, after much debate, was carried by 160 to 100. Major Osborne, Charles Ball, and Mr. Ponsonby opposed it; Sir Henry Cavendish and the Right Hon. David La Touche supported it. Mr. Goold concluded a speech of much talent and energy with the following prophetic words:—

I know the ministers must succeed—but I will not go away with an aching heart—because I know that the liberties of the people must ultimately triumph. The people must at present submit, because they cannot resist 120,000 *armed men. But the period will occur, when, as in* 1782, *England may be weak, and Ireland sufficiently strong to recover her lost liberties!!*

On the 22nd a message came from the Lords, stating they had agreed to the Articles of Union, and requesting the concurrence of the Commons on the subject, which was carried on debate by 67 to 37. On the next day Lord Castlereagh moved that the House should depute certain of the members to wait upon the Lord Lieutenant with the address in its favour, upon which Mr.

* There were circumstances said to have been connected with this act, that are too shocking to mention.

O'Donnell moved as an amendment that the generals, staff-officers, placemen, and pensioners, members of that House, should go up with it; namely:—

John Staples, member for Antrim, Examinator of Customs, and who has a pension.
William Arthur Crosbie, member for Trim, Steward of the Household, Customer and Comptroller of Wexford, Commissioner of Stamp Duties.
Sir Boyle Roche, member for Old Leighlin, Gentleman Usher.
George Miller, member for Castlebar, Gentleman of the Bedchamber.
Sir Chichester Fortescue, member for Trim, Ulster King-at-Arms.
Edward Cooke, member for Old Leighlin, Under Secretary to the Civil Department, Keeper of the Phœnix Park, Customer of Kinsale, and, in reversion, of the place of Clerk to the House of Commons.
William Elliott, member for St. Canice, Under Secretary of Military Department.
Thomas Lindsay, member for Castlebar, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, Receiver General of Stamp Duties.
Right Hon. John M. Mason, member for St. Canice, Commissioner of Treasury.
Right Hon. Lodge Morris, member for Dingle, Commissioner of Treasury.
Sir G. Shee, member for Knocktoper, Secretary to Treasury.
Lord Loftus, member for Wexford, Teller of Exchequer.
St. George Daly, member for Galway, Prime Sergeant.
John Stewart, member for Bangor, Solicitor-General.
Henry Westenra, member for Monaghan, Seneschal of Manors.
John Longfield, member for Mallow, Customer of Cork.
Francis McNamara, member for Killybegs, Customer of Dingle.
Stephen Moore, member for Kells, Accountant-General.
William Knott, member for Taghmon, Commissioner of Appeals.
William Wynne, member for Sligo, ditto, ditto.
Patrick Duigenan, member for Armagh, King's Advocate-General.
Richard Herbert, member for Granard, Commissioner of Accounts.
Thomas Burgh, member for Fore, ditto, ditto.
Charles M. Ormsby, member for Duleek, Commissioner of Barracks.
William Gore, member for Carrick, ditto, ditto.
Denham Jephson, member for Mallow, Pensioner, 600*l.* per annum.
George Hatton, member for Lisburn, Commissioner of Stamps.
Maurice Fitzgerald, member for Kerry, Commissioner of Revenue.
John Longfield, member for Cork, ditto, ditto.
Richard Annesly, member for Middleton, ditto, ditto.
John Townsend, member for Castle Martyr, ditto, ditto.
Charles H. Coste, member for Queen's County, ditto, ditto.
J. O. Vandeleur, member for Ennis, ditto, ditto.
Hon. Walter Yelverton, member for Tuam, Cursitor of Chancery.
C. Osborne, member for Carysfort, Counsel to Commissioners of Revenue.
Hon. F. H. Hutchinson, member for Naas, Collector to Port of Dublin.

Right Hon. Wm. Forward, member for John's Town, Treasurer to Post Office.
Ponsonby Tottenham, member for Clonmines, Pension 300*l.* per annum.
Sir John Blaquiere, member for New Town, Pension 2,231*l.* 8*s.* 11*d.*, per annum, Alnager of Ireland, Director of Paving Board, &c.
Peter Holmes, member for Doneraile, Commissioner of Stamps.
Hugh Howard, member for John's Town, ditto, ditto.
Robert Johnson, member for Philip's Town, Counsel to Commissioners of Revenue.
George Harrison Reed, member for Fethard, Surveyor of Wexford.
Francis Leigh, member for Wexford, Collector of Dublin.
James Cuffe, member for Tulsk, Treasurer to Barrack Board.
John Hobson, member for Clonakilty, Master of Stores.
Col. R. Uniacke, member for Youghal, Surveyor General of Ordnance.
H. Alexander, member for Londonderry, Chairman of Ways and Means.
Theophilus Jones, member for Leitrim, Pension, Revenue Establishment.
Lord Charles Fitzgerald, member for Ardfert, Muster-Master-General.
Thomas Pakenham, member for Longford, Lieut.-Gen. of Ordnance.
Richard Magennis, member for Carlingford, Clerk of Ordnance.
Sir Henry Cavendish, member for Lismore, Receiver General of Revenues.
Hon. John Jocelyn, member for Dundalk, Surveyor of Belfast.
Hon. Henry Skeffington, member for Antrim, Governor of Cork.
Hon. John Stratford, member for Baltinglass, Paymaster of Foreign Forces.
Edmund Stanley, member for Lanesborough, Third Sergeant, and pension of 400*l.* a year to his wife.
Robert Tighe, member for Carrick, Comptroller Customs in Dublin.
Walter Jones, member for Coleraine, compensation for payment of corn premiums coastways.
T. Nesbit, member for Cavan, pensioner.
Hon. A. Creighton, member for Lifford, Register of Forfeitures.
General Nugent, member for Charleville, Adjutant-General.
General Craddock, member for Thomas Town, Quarter-Master-General.
General Eustace, member for Felthard, Governor of Ross Castle.
General Gardiner, member for Knoctoper, Staff.
General Lake, member for Armagh, ditto.
General Hutchinson, member for City of Cork, ditto.
General Dunne, member for Moreborough, ditto.
General Henniker, member for Kildare, ditto.
Stewart Bruce, member for Lisburn, Aide-de-Camp to Lord Lieutenant.
Thomas Casey, member for Kilmallock, Commissioner of Bankrupts.
Thomas Prendergast, member for Clonakilty, ditto.

For this motion there were 18, against it, 50.

On the 26th the Union Bill was read a second time, the numbers being 117 to 73. Mr. Grattan then moved that the 1st August should be substituted for 31st May for the committee; for this

the ayes were 87, the noes 124. On this debate Mr. Grattan, after a long speech, concluded by saying:—

From the bad terms which attend the Union, I am naturally led to the foul means* by which it has been obtained—dismissals from office, perversion of the place bill, sale of peerage, purchase of boroughs, appointment of sheriffs with a view to prevent the meetings of freemen and freeholders, for the purpose of expressing their opinion on the subject of a Legislative Union—in short, the most avowed corruption, threats, and stratagems, accompanied by martial law, to deprive a nation of her liberty; and so very great and beneficial have been the efforts, that his Majesty's Ministers have actually resorted to a partial dissolution of Parliament, at the very time they declined to resort to a general election. The sense of Parliament and people was against them; they change, therefore, the Parliament without recurring to the people, but procure a number of returns, exceeding their present majority, from private boroughs vacated with a view to return a Court member, who should succeed a gentleman that would not vote for the Union. Here, then, is a Parliament made by the Minister, not the people, and made for the question. Under these circumstances, in opposition to the declared sense of the country, has been passed a measure imposing on the people a new constitution, and subverting the old one.

The constitution may be *for a time* so lost; the character of the country may be so lost; the Ministers of the Crown will, or may perhaps at length, find, that it is not so easy to put down for ever an ancient and a respectable nation, by abilities, however great, and by power and by

* The bribery of Sir William Gleadowe Newcoman is described by Sir Jonah Barrington in his "*Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*," Paris edition. In consequence of the deficiency in the Stamp Duties that appeared in the accounts of his father (who was one of the Receivers-General of Stamps), a large sum was due to the country, which Sir Jonah Barrington states at 20,000*l.*, and which from the memorial presented to Lord Cornwallis appears, with interest, to have amounted, at least, to 10,000*l.* Yet for this sum the Government chose to accept 2,000*l.* and exonerate Sir William. The document settling this is registered in the Rolls Office, Dublin, and bears the signature of the Attorney-General, *J. Toler*. In addition to this proceeding, the wife of the defaulter was created a peeress!

corruption, however irresistible. Liberty may repair her golden beams, and with redoubled heart animate the country. The cry of loyalty will not long continue against the principles of liberty. Loyalty is a noble, a judicious, and a capacious principle; but in these countries loyalty, distinct from liberty, is corruption, not loyalty.

The cry of the connection will not in the end avail against the principles of liberty. Connection is a wise and profound policy; but connection without an Irish Parliament is connection without its own principle, without analogy of condition, without the pride of honour that should attend it, is innovation, is peril, is subjugation—not connection.

The cry of disaffection will not in the end avail against the principle of liberty.

Identification is a solid and imperial maxim, necessary for the preservation of freedom—necessary for that of empire; but without union of hearts—with a separate Government and without a separate Parliament—identification is extinction, is dishonour, is conquest—not identification.

Yet I do not give up the country; I see her in a swoon, but she is not dead. Though in her tomb she lies helpless and motionless, still there is on her lips a spirit of life, and on her cheek a glow of beauty.

> "Thou art not conquered; beauty's ensign yet
> Is crimson on thy lips and in thy cheeks,
> And death's pale flag is not advanced there."

While a plank of the vessel sticks together, I will not leave her. Let the courtier present his flimsy sail, and carry the light bark of his faith with every new breath of wind—I will remain anchored here, with fidelity to the fortunes of my country, faithful to her freedom—faithful to her fall!!!

Can Ireland ever forget these words?

On this occasion Mr. Peter Burrowes having been alluded to by Lord Castlereagh, delivered a spirited and most able reply, and, after answering the argument, he alluded to Mr. Grattan, on whom he passed the following beautiful panegyric:—

I feel but little any portion of the noble Lord's (Castlereagh) obloquy which may attach to me or to my humble efforts, but I own I cannot repress my indignation at the audacious boldness of the calumny, which would asperse one of the most exalted characters which any nation ever produced, and that in a country which owes its liberties and its greatness to the energy of his exertions, and in the very house which has so often been the theatre of his glorious labours and splendid achievements. I remember that man the theme of universal panegyric, the wonder and the boast of Ireland for his genius and virtue: his name silenced the sceptic upon the reality of genuine patriotism: to doubt the purity of his motives was a heresy which no tongue dared to utter: envy was lost in admiration, and even those whose crimes he scourged, blended exalted praises with the murmurs of resentment. He covered our unfledged Constitution with the wings of talents, as the eagle covers her young, like her he soared, and like her he could behold the rays, whether of royal favour or royal anger, with undazzled, unintimidated eye. If, according to Demosthenes, to grow with the growth and to decay with the decline of our country be the true criterion of a good citizen, how infinitely did this man, even in the moment of his lowest depression, surpass those upstart patriots who only become visible when their country vanishes.

Sir, there is something more singularly curious, and, according to my estimation of things, enviable in the fate of this great man—his character and his consequence are, as it were, vitally interwoven with the greatness of his country. The one cannot be high and the other low—the one cannot stand and the other perish.

This was so well understood by those who have so long meditated to put down the Constitution of Ireland, that, feeling that they could not seduce, they have incessantly laboured to calumniate her most vigilant sentinel and ablest champion. They appealed to every unguarded prejudice, to every assailable weakness of a generous but credulous people, they watched every favourable moment of irritation or of terror to pour in the detested poison of calumny.

Sir, it will be found on a retrospect of Ireland since 1782, that her liberties never received a wound, that a cor-

respondent stab was not levelled at his character, and, when it was vainly hoped that his imperishable fame was laid in the dust, the times were deemed ripe for the extinction of our Constitution.

Sir, these impious labours cannot finally succeed, glory and liberty are not easily effaced,—Grattan and the Constitution will survive the storm.

On the 6th of June Lord Corry moved an address to the King setting forth the entire of the Union proceedings, and recording therein the protest of the opposition and the people. It was an elaborate document, recapitulating the various points of the case and the injury likely to be felt by the country from the measure. It is printed at length in the Appendix. The numbers were 77 for and 135 against it.

The report from the committee was then read and carried by 153 to 88. Further resistance was now in vain, the opposition being no longer able to defeat this measure, at length desisted from their labours, and, as Mr. Grattan expressed it, "*Finding all useless, we retired with safe consciences but with breaking hearts.*"

When it was moved that the bill be engrossed, Mr. O'Donnell, with a just and becoming indignation, proposed that it should be burned. He was severely assailed for this, and at length was persuaded to withdraw the amendment, and on Saturday, the 7th June, the bill was read a third time, on the motion of Lord Castlereagh, and passed. It was brought to the House of Lords on the 11th, committed* on the 12th, by a majority of 76 to 17, and on the 1st August received the royal assent, and Ireland ceased to be a nation!

* It was introduced into the British House of Commons by Mr. Pitt, and sent to the Lords on the 24th of June, and received the Royal assent on the 2nd of July.

What an hour of maddening agony was that to every patriot, but most to him who had so long fostered and shielded the country which he then beheld stricken down, robbed, dishonoured, and mangled by a confederacy of aliens, traitors, and bullies!

Thus ended the Irish Parliament. Some surrendered it through fear of Jacobinism; others through terror of the authorities; others through fear of the Catholics; others through bribery; and others through delusive hopes. The English Government became alarmists; the Irish corrupt and bigoted. The more that these circumstances are considered, the more it will appear that the efforts of these patriots were laudable in the highest degree, and that their conduct merited all the praise that belongs to virtuous actions. Let their names, then, never be obliterated from the remembrance of all who value freedom! They had to contend against the overwhelming influence of a profligate court, against the corrupt satellites of a daring minister, against an army licensed, unscrupulous, and at hand; so that it is surprising that with such difficulties opposed to them, and with such bad materials, such a resistance could have been effected. Even their natural ally, the press, was intimidated or seduced. The newspapers were afraid to publish the proceedings of the times; and the motion of Mr. O'Donnell, to burn the Union Bill, is not to be found in most of them. The reports of the debates were destroyed through the influence and bribery of the Government. The members of the Opposition had got their speeches written out and corrected: they were entrusted for publication to a person of the name of Moore. Mr. Foster* doubted his honesty, and cautioned the party against him, saying he

* This anecdote the writer had from Mr. Foster (the Speaker).

This was the real and secret motive of his conduct at the Union; the strength of the empire was not his object; he did not seek for or wish to secure it, for he left the Catholics excluded; it was altogether a trick, and the trick of a dishonest man. This the Irish should have seen, as the Scotch probably would, but Ireland was too much divided. Religious discord was the bane and the ruin of her prosperity; but the Union was a question on which she should have made a stand, and all parties have united. It formed a good ground for separation from England. The nation should have refused to act under it; for it was not the piece of parchment that constituted the solidity of the measure, but the subsequent acquiescence of the people. They ought to have resisted, and gone to the leading lords, and have frightened them; they could have done it easily; a little of the Roman spirit, and a very few men, would have done it. Those heavy, dictatorial, empty, nobles would have shrunk—Lord Shannon would have shrunk—Lord Ely would have shrunk —Lord Clare would have shrunk; it was his nature; or if Lord Castlereagh (who would not have receded) had fallen, the measure in all probability would not have been carried, or, if carried, the country would have been thrown on her metal and prepared for war. The corruption of the House, and the badness of the Parliament, was not the reason for its abolition. The institution was good, the body was on the spot, ready and attentive; neither was it the Place Bill of Mr. Forbes that caused it, nor the gross abuse of the nominal office of Escheatorship that caused it. It was Mr. Pitt,*

* It does not appear that Mr. Pitt's policy towards Ireland was steady or consistent. The following extract from one of his letters, shows that, at the time, *he was friendly to a reform in the Irish Parliament, hostile in the extreme to the Roman Catholics*, and adverse to the Union; preserving, at the same time, a selfish mercantile spirit; it

—his money, his martial law, his bribery,* his rebellion, his troops; he kept them at a distance, but he kept them ready. One immediate result of the insurrection was, that not only the United Irishmen were put down, but all moderate men also; they were awed, and afraid to act even in a constitutional way. However, it cannot be denied, that the main cause arose from the situation of the country. She was a nation without a people; the Representation was that of individuals, and was bought as a marketable commodity; the majority of the people were not admitted into the Government of the country, and the *formation* of the Constitution did not remedy the defect. The people were not interested, and no

will throw some light upon his character, and surprise many of his admirers, though it will afford little satisfaction to the victims of his ill-judged policy towards Ireland. He writes to the Lord-Lieutenant as follows:—

"I own to you the line to which my mind at present inclines (open to whatever new observations or arguments may be suggested to me), is to give Ireland an almost unlimited communication of commercial advantages, if we can receive in return some security, that *her strength and riches will be our benefit*, and that she will contribute from time to time in their increasing proportions to the common exigencies of the empire, and having, by holding out this, removed, I trust, every temptation to Ireland to consider her interest as separate from England; to be ready while we discountenance wild and unconstitutional attempts which strike at the root of all authority, to give real efficacy and popularity to Government by acceding (if such a line can be good) to a *prudent and temperate reform of Parliament*, which may guard against and gradually cure real defects and mischiefs, may show a sufficient regard to the interests and even prejudices of individuals who are concerned, and *may unite the Protestant interest in excluding the Catholics from any share in the Representation or the Government of the Country!*"—Mr. Pitt's Letter to the Duke of Rutland, 7th October, 1784.

In another letter he says that local prejudices and partial advantages should be relinquished to consult without distinction for the general benefit of the empire.—"This cannot be done but by making England and Ireland one country in effect, *though for local concerns under distinct legislatures*, one in the communication of advantages; if their unity is broken *or rendered absolutely precarious*, the system is defective and there is an end of the whole."—Unpublished Letter, 6th January, 1785.

* Sir Jonah Barrington says in his history, that he read the dispatch from Mr. Pitt to Lord Cornwallis, desiring him not to press the Union unless he was certain of a majority of 50.

people will ever fight for an abstract proposition of liberty. Hence it is almost a matter of surprise that England did not attempt the Union before. But another and a wiser course was open to her; if, instead of rewarding Lord Clare with power and confidence in proportion to his offences, Mr. Pitt had punished him or discarded him, or even had not made him minister, as in 1789, when he declared that the majority of the House of Commons had been bought formerly, and must be bought again—as in 1793, when he reprobated conciliation, and when he reviled the Catholic petition, which in effect his Majesty recommended, and the bill which his Majesty ventured to espouse; or when he declared that the Catholics must be determined enemies to his throne; or in 1795, when he declared that he would make the Irish as tame as cats; or in 1797, when, as head of the University, he proposed illegal questions under an illegal oath, and compelled those who refused to submit and accuse themselves; or in 1798, when he tolerated torture, and justified the principle—had this been done; had Government discarded such a minister, there would have been no rebellion,* and no Union; but, instead of a rebellion, the British Government would have had the solid weight of the population of Ireland, and the warm heart of the nation for ever. It is probable that French intrigue, French party, democratic partisans would have existed,—in every state in Europe these were to be found,—but it required ministers like Lord Clare and Mr. Pitt to make them

* One of the items of expense at that melancholy period which the mind grieves to dwell on, was for losses sustained in the insurrection. The sums claimed by suffering loyalists and which were decided on by the Commissioners, amounted to 823,517*l.*, of which there was disallowed, 71,470*l.* What must not have been the losses of the opposite party? A good argument this against civil war!

general, and to make them as lasting as the Union, perhaps as the connexion; for it is rarely that a deep popular passion can be allayed by removing present causes of complaint—retribution and security are equally claimed.

The seeds for the destruction of the Irish Parliament had been carefully sown so early as the time of James the First, when he created forty boroughs to enable his retainers to return the majority, thereby counteracting the measure of Queen Elizabeth, who had divided Ireland into shires,* and enabled the community to elect the House of Commons. Mr. Grattan imagined that he could have eradicated this national evil, and he deeply regretted one circumstance in his life, that he had not proposed the addition of two members to the county constituency. He said there was a moment when he thought that the House of Commons would have adopted such a proposition, that a single resolution would have effected it, and he scarcely forgave himself the omission. It is probable that the period he alluded to was that of 1784, when Lord Charlemont, Mr. Flood, and Mr. Pitt were favourable to Reform. Such a measure might have prevented the Union, but that it would have passed appears rather doubtful.

Yet this Parliament, in despite of its defects, did more for the country in the short space of time it was allowed to live, than England had effected in all her long and varied struggles for liberty. Ireland removed the restraints that for centuries before had been imposed on her commerce and her constitution; she repealed Poyning's law—she insisted on the repeal of the 6th

* Historians erroneously represent James as entitled to the merit of that measure, but it fairly belongs to Elizabeth; hers was a constitutional act, his was merely ministerial.

of George the First*—she obtained free trade—she obtained an independent Constitution—she restored the final judicature to her Lords—she established the independence of her Judges, she secured to the country the benefits of the Habeas Corpus Act—she purified the elective franchise—she repealed the Perpetual Mutiny Bill, and placed on record the immortal resolve, that a standing army in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament, was contrary to law, (in itself a charter of liberty).—All these splendid acquisitions she obtained in 1782, after a short reign of a few days, by means of her Parliament, freed from foreign control, and influenced by Irish feelings and Irish counsels.

Subsequently, after a severe struggle against a corrupt Court, she obtained a Navigation Act, a Pension Bill, a Place Bill, a Responsibility Bill. She diffused the spirit of religious liberty, and emancipated, in a degree, the mind of her people. She repealed numerous penal laws, and gave to Roman Catholics property and power, and accompanied the possession of land with the right of the elective franchise. She opened to them the Bar, and the Assistant Barristers' Bench; and if she had not been thwarted by British influence, she would have given to them full and complete Emancipation, and placed, in every respect, the Roman Catholic on an equality with his Protestant fellow-countryman. England had rights and precedents of her own to follow. She could boast of a proud constitutional ancestry, who traced their names—their descent—their glories—in hereditary succession to the Great Charters of their country, that they had thirty times confirmed. But no such advantages were possessed by Ireland, where it might be said—

* An English Act that Mr. Fox got repealed.

"Havoc and spoil and ruin are my gain."

"Hinc exaudiri gemitus *et sæva sonare*
Verbera, tum stridor ferri, tractæque catenæ.
Quæ scelerum facies. O VIRGO effare! *quibusve*
Urgentur pœnis! qui tantus plangor ad auras!"

Ireland had to create almost every thing, and to create it out of chaos. It was a godlike work, and, like the Divine Creation, required fiends to destroy it.*

* As events justified Mr. Grattan's predictions before the Union, so they have verified his forebodings after; not only in respect to the commerce and the finances of the country, but of the *connexion*.

Soon after 1800, Ireland was found unable to bear the imperial contributions, the additional taxation, and the increasing absentee drain; she added enormously to her debt (from 13 millions as it was in 1799, or 24 millions in 1800, to 116 millions as it was in 1814) she altered altogether the nature of her commerce—from manufactures to corn and cattle. At length she became bankrupt, and the debts and exchequers were consolidated in 1817.

As to her revenue, it was calculated in 1822 that 3,500,000*l.* of additional taxation had only produced 50,000*l.* In 1803, it was 4,337,269*l.*; in 1804, it was 3,717,942*l.*; and in 1841, it was only 4,107,066*l.*; and in 1842, it was 4,198,689*l.* As to the connexion; in the time of Lord Townsend, the military force to be kept in Ireland was fixed at 12,000 by Act of Parliament, and in the Duke of Portland's time (1782) there were only 5,000 troops. Since the Union, the minister found it necessary to establish a force of 10,000 armed police, and to keep up a regular army of upwards of 20,000 men, and this in time of profound peace. With regard to the condition of the people; the census of 1841 reports the number of persons engaged in trade and manufactures as amounting only to 1,953,688 individuals; and the number employed in agriculture as amounting to 5,406,743: the situation and circumstances of this latter class is thus described by the Commissioners of Land Inquiry in 1845, who report as follows:—

"The agricultural labourers of Ireland suffer the greatest privations and hardships." "They depend upon precarious and casual employment for subsistence." "They are badly housed, badly fed, badly clothed, and badly paid for their labour." "It would be impossible to describe adequately the sufferings and privations which the cottiers and labourers, and their families in most parts of the country endure." "In many districts their only food is the potatoe, their only beverage water." "Their cabins are seldom a protection against the weather." "*A bed or blanket is a rare luxury.*" "Nearly in all, their pig *and their manure heap constitute their only property.*" "A large proportion of the entire population comes within the designation of agricultural labourers, *and endure sufferings greater than the people of any other country in Europe have to sustain.*"

In conclusion it is to be observed that the Commissioners on the Railway Report laid before Parliament prior to the above, stated that the number of destitute persons found annually in Ireland amounted to 2,300,000!

Such are the results of forty years of Union! in such manner have the promises then held out been realized!

ORIGINAL RED LIST*

OF THE MEMBERS WHO VOTED AGAINST THE UNION IN 1799 AND 1800.

Thus * marked were not in the Division among those who voted against the Union, on the 24th of January, 1799, of 111 against, to 106 for.

1 Hon. A. Acheson, son to Lord Gosford.
2 William C. Alcock, County Wexford.
3 Mervyn Archdall, County Fermanagh.
*4 W. H. Armstrong, refused all terms from Government.
*5 Sir Richard Butler, changed sides. See Black List.
6 John Bagwell, changed sides twice. See Black List.
*7 Peter Burrowes, afterwards Judge of the Insolvent Court; a steady Anti-Unionist.
*8 John Bagwell, jun., changed sides. See Black List.
9 John Ball, member for Drogheda; incorruptible.
*10 Charles Ball, brother to the preceding.
11 Sir Jonah Barrington, King's Counsel, Judge for the Admiralty, refused all terms.
*12 Charles Bushe, afterwards Solicitor-General and Chief Justice of Ireland; incorruptible.
13 John C. Beresford, seceded from Mr. Ponsonby in 1799, on his declaration of independence.
14 Arthur Brown, member of the University, changed sides in 1800; was appointed Prime Sergeant by Lord Castlereagh, through Mr. Cooke; of all others the most open and palpable case. See Black List.
*15 William Blakeney, a pensioner, but opposed to Government.
16 William Burton, sold his borough, Carlow, to a Unionist (Lord Tullamore), but remained staunch himself.
*17 Henry V. Brooke.
*18 Blayney Balfour.
19 David Babbington, connected with Lord Belmore.
*20 Hon. James Butler (Marquis of Ormonde) voted in 1800 against the Union, but with Government on Lord Corry's motion.
*21 Col. J. Maxwell Barry (Lord Farnham), nephew to the Speaker.

---

* By the Red and Black Lists it is *evident*, beyond all contradiction, that those who had, in 1799, successfully opposed the Union, or had *declared* against it, Lord Castlereagh, palpably purchased *twenty-five* before the *second* discussion in 1800, which made a difference of fifty votes in favour of Government; and it is therefore equally evident, that, by the public and actual bribery of those twenty-five members, and not by any change of opinion in the country, or any fair or honest majority, Mr. Pitt and his instruments carried the Union.

The observations annexed to the names in these Lists, were, at the time, either in actual proof, or sufficiently notorious to have been printed in various documents at that epoch. As to the House of Lords, the servile—almost miraculous—submission with which they surrendered their hereditary prerogatives, honours, rights, and dignities, into the hands of the Lords Clare and Castlereagh, is a subject unprecedented.

22 William Bagwell, changed sides twice, concluded as a Unionist. See Black List.
23 Viscount Corry (now Lord Belmore), dismissed from his regiment by Lord Cornwallis; a zealous leader of the opposition.
24 Robert Crowe, a barrister, bribed by Lord Castlereagh.
25 Lord Clements, afterwards Lord Leitrim.
26 Lord Cole, afterwards Lord Enniskillen, unfortunately dissented from Mr. Ponsonby's motion for a declaration of independence in 1799, whereby the Union was revived and carried.
27 Hon. Lowry Cole, a general; brother to Lord Cole.
*28 R. Shapland Carew.
29 Hon. A. Creighton, changed sides and became a Unionist. See Black List.
30 Hon. J. Creighton, changed sides. See Black List.
31 Joseph Edward Cooper.
32 James Cane, changed sides. See Black List.
33 Lord Caufield (afterwards Earl Charlemont), son to Earl Charlemont, a principal leader of the opposition.
34 Henry Coddington.
35 George Crookshank, a son of the Judge of the Common Pleas.
36 Dennis B. Daly, brother-in-law to Mr. Ponsonby; a most active Anti-Unionist.
*37 Noah Dalway.
38 Richard Dawson.
39 Arthur Dawson, formerly a banker, father to the late Under-Secretary.
40 Francis Dobbs, famous for his doctrine on the Millennium; an enthusiastic Anti-Unionist.
41 John Egan, King's Counsel, chairman of Kilmainham; offered a Judge's seat, but could not be purchased, though far from rich.
42 R. L. Edgeworth.
43 George Evans.
44 Sir John Freke, Bart. (afterwards Lord Carberry).
45 Frederick Falkiner, though a distressed person, could not be purchased.
46 Rt. Hon. J. Fitzgerald, Prime Serjeant of Ireland; could not be bought, and was dismissed from his high office by Lord Cornwallis; father to Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald (afterwards Lord Fitzgerald).
47 William C. Fortescue, one of the three who inconsiderately opposed Mr. Ponsonby's motion.
*48 Rt. Hon. J. Foster, Speaker, the chief of the opposition throughout the whole contest.
49 Hon. Thomas Foster.
*50 Sir T. Fetherston, Bart., changed sides. See Black List.
51 Arthur French, unfortunately coincided with Mr. Fortescue in 1799, against Mr. Ponsonby's motion.
*52 Chichester Fortescue, King at Arms; bought over in 1800 by Lord Castlereagh: voted both sides; ended a Unionist.
53 William Gore, bought by Lord Castlereagh in 1800.
54 Hamilton Gorges, a distressed man, but could not be purchased: father-in-law to Secretary Cooke.
*55 H. Grattan.

*56 Thomas Goold (afterwards Serjeant and Master in Chancery), brought into Parliament by the Anti-Unionists; incorruptible.
57 Hans Hamilton, member for Dublin County.
58 Edward Hardman, City of Drogheda; the Speaker's friend.
59 Francis Hardy, author of the Life of Charlemont; brother-in-law to the Bishop of Down.
60 Sir Joseph Hoare.
*61 William Hoare Hume, Wicklow County.
*62 Edward Hoare, though very old and stone blind, attended all the debates, and sat up all the nights of the debate.
*63 Bartholomew Hoare, King's Counsel.
64 Alexander Hamilton, King's Counsel; son to the Baron.
65 Hon. A. C. Hamilton.
66 Sir F. Hopkins, Bart., prevailed on to take money to vacate, in 1800, and let in a Unionist.
*67 H. Irwin.
68 Gilbert King.
69 Charles King.
70 Hon. Robert King.
71 Lord Kingsborough (Earl Kingston).
72 Hon. George Knox, brother to Lord Northland; lukewarm.
73 Francis Knox, vacated his seat for Lord Castlereagh.
74 Rt. Hon. Henry King.
75 Major King, he opened the Bishop of Clogher's Borough in 1800.
*76 Gustavus Lambert, brother to Countess Talbot.
77 David Latouche, jun., banker.
78 Robert Latouche, ditto.
79 John Latouche, sen., ditto.
80 John Latouche, jun., ditto.
81 Charles Powell Leslie.
82 Edward Lee, member for the County of Waterford; zealous.
83 Sir Thomas Leighton, Bart., a banker.
84 Lord Maxwell (died Lord Farnham).
85 Alexander Montgomery.
86 Sir J. Macartney, Bart., much distressed, but could not be bribed; nephew by affinity to the Speaker.
87 William Thomas Mansell, actually purchased by Lord Castlereagh.
*88 Stephen Moore, changed sides on Lord Corry's motion. See Debates.
*89 John Moore.
90 Arthur Moore (afterwards Judge of the Common Pleas), a staunch Anti-Unionist.
91 Lord Mathew (Earl Llandaff), Tipperary County.
*92 Thomas Mahon.
93 John Metge, brother to the Baron of the Exchequer.
94 Richard Neville, had been a dismissed Treasury officer; sold his vote to be reinstated; changed sides. See Black List.
95 Thomas Newenham, the author of various works on Ireland; one of the steadiest Anti-Unionist.
96 Charles O'Hara, Sligo County.
97 Sir Edward O'Brien, Clare County.
98 Col. Hugh O'Donnel, a most ardent Anti-Unionist; dismissed from his regiment of Mayo militia.

99 James Moore O'Donnel, killed by Mr. Bingham in a duel.
100 Hon. W. O'Callaghan, brother to Lord Lismore.
101 Henry Osborn, could not be bribed; his brother was.
102 Rt. Hon. George Ogle, Wexford County.
103 Joseph Preston, an eccentric character; could not be purchased.
104 John Preston, of Bellintor, was purchased by a title (Lord Tara), and his brother, a Parson, got a living of 700*l.* a year.
105 Rt. Hon. Sir J. Parnell, Chancellor of the Exchequer, dismissed by Lord Castlereagh; incorruptible.
*106 Henry Parnell.
107 W. C. Plunkett (now Lord Plunket).
108 Rt. Hon. W. B. Ponsonby (afterwards Lord Ponsonby).
*109 J. B. Ponsonby (afterwards Lord Ponsonby).
110 Major W. Ponsonby, a general, killed at Waterloo.
111 Rt. Hon. G. Ponsonby (afterwards Lord Chancellor), died of apoplexy.
112 Sir Laurence Parsons, King's County (Earl of Rosse); made a remarkably fine speech.
113 Richard Power, nephew to the Baron of the Exchequer.
114 Abal Ram, changed sides.
115 Gustavus Rochfort, County Westmeath; seduced by Government, and changed sides in 1800. See Black List.
116 John S. Rochfort, nephew to the Speaker.
117 Sir William Richardson.
*118 John Reilly, changed sides. See Black List.
*119 William E. Reilly.
*120 Charles Ruxton.
121 William P. Ruxton.
*122 Clotworthy Rowley, changed sides. See Black List.
*123 William Rowley, ditto. See ditto.
*124 J. Rowley, ditto. See ditto.
125 Francis Saunderson.
126 William Smyth, Westmeath.
127 James Stewart.
128 Hon. W. J. Skeffington.
129 Francis Savage.
*130 Francis Synge.
131 Henry Stewart.
132 Sir R. St. George, Bart.
133 Hon. Benjamin Stratford (Lord Aldborough), gained by Lord Castlereagh; changed sides. See Black List.
134 Nathaniel Sneyd.
135 Thomas Stannus, changed sides; Lord Portarlington's member. See Black List.
*136 Robert Shaw, a banker.
*137 Rt. Hon. William Saurin (afterwards Attorney-General), a steady but calm Anti-Unionist.
138 William Tighe.
139 Henry Tighe.
140 John Taylor.
141 Thomas Townshend.
142 Hon. Richard Trench, voted against the Union in 1799; was gained by Lord Castlereagh, whose relative he married, and

voted for it in 1800; was created an Earl, and made an ambassador to Holland.

143 Hon. R. Taylor.

144 Charles Vereker (now Lord Gort) City Limerick.

145 Owen Wynne.

146 John Waller.

147 E. D. Wilson, first voted against the Union; purchased by Lord Castlereagh; he was Lord Clare's brother-in-law. See Black List.

*148 Thomas Whaley.

*149 Nicholas Westby.

*150 John Wolfe, member for the County Wicklow; Colonel of the Kildare militia, refused to vote for Government, and was cashiered; could not be purchased.

ORIGINAL BLACK LIST

OF THOSE WHO VOTED FOR THE UNION IN 1799 and 1800.

Thus * marked were not in the Division among those who voted for the Union on the 24th of January 1799, of 106 for, to 111 against.

*1 R. Aldridge, an English *clerk* in the Secretary's office; *no* connexion with Ireland.

2 Henry Alexander, Chairman of Ways and Means; cousin of Lord Caledon; his brother made a bishop; himself Colonial Secretary at the Cape of Good Hope.

3 Richard Archdall, Commissioner of the Board of Works.

4 William Bailey, ditto ditto.

5 Right Hon. J. Beresford, First Commissioner of Revenue; brother-in-law to Lord Clare.

6 J. Beresford, jun., then purse-bearer to Lord Clare, afterwards a parson and Lord Decies.

7 Marcus Beresford, a colonel in the army, son to the bishop, Lord Clare's nephew.

8 J. Bingham, created a peer; got 8,000*l.* for two seats, and 15,000*l.* compensation for Tuam. This gentleman first offered himself for *sale* to the Anti-Unionists: Lord Clanmorris.

9 Joseph H. Blake, *created a peer*—Lord Wallscourt, &c.

*10 Sir J. G. Blackwood, *created a peer*—Lord Dufferin.

11 Sir John Blaquiere, numerous offices and pensions, and created a peer—Lord De Blaquiere.

12 Anthony Botet, appointed Commissioner of the Barrack Board, 500*l.* a-year.

*13 Colonel Burton, brother to Lord Conyngham; a colonel in the army.

*14 *Sir Richard Butler*, purchased and changed sides; voted *against* the Union in 1799, and *for* it in 1800.

[15 Lord Boyle, son to Lord Shannon; they got an *immense* sum of money for their seats and boroughs; at 15,000*l.* each borough.

16 Right Hon. D. Brown, brother to Lord Sligo.

17 Stewart Bruce, Gentleman Usher at Dublin Castle; a baronet.

18 George Burdet, Commissioner of a Public Board, 500*l.* per annum.
*19 George Bunbury, Ditto.
20 *Arthur Browne, changed sides and principles*, and was appointed serjeant; in 1799 opposed the Union, and supported it in 1800; he was Senior Fellow of Dublin University; lost his seat the ensuing election, and died.
*21 *John Bagwell, sen., changed twice;* got half the patronage of Tipperary; his son a dean, &c. &c.
*22 *John Bagwell, jun., ditto;* got the Tipperary Regiment, &c.
*23 William Bagwell, his brother; changed sides.
24 Lord Castlereagh, the Irish Minister.
25 George Cavendish, Secretary to the Treasury during pleasure; son to Sir Henry.
26 Sir H. Cavendish, Receiver-General during pleasure; deeply indebted to the Crown.
27 Sir R. Chinnery, placed in office after the Union.
*28 James Cane, renegaded and got a pension.
*29 Thomas Casey, a Commissioner of Bankrupts under Lord Clare made a city magistrate.
*30 Colonel C. Cope, renegaded; got a regiment and the patronage of his county.
*31 General Cradock, returned by Government; much military rank; Lord Howden.
*32 James Crosby, a regiment and the patronage of Kerry, jointly; seconded the Address.
33 Edward Cooke, Under Secretary at the Castle.
34 Charles H. Coote, obtained a regiment (which was taken from Colonel Warburton), patronage of Queen's county, and a peerage (Lord Castlecoote), and 7,500*l.* in cash for his interest at the borough of Maryborough, in which, in fact, it was *proved* before the Commissioners that Sir Jonah Barrington had more interest than his lordship.
35 Right Hon. I. Corry, appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer, on dismissal of Sir John Parnell.
36 Sir J. Cotter, privately bought over by cash.
37 Richard Cotter.
*38 Hon. H. Creighton } renegaded; privately purchased.
*39 Hon. J. Creighton }
40 W. A. Crosbie, Comptroller to the Lord Lieutenant's Household.
*41 James Cuffe, natural son to Mr. Cuffe of the Board of Works; his father created Lord Tyrawly.
*42 General Dunne, returned for Maryborough by the united influence of Lord Castlecoote and Government, to keep out Mr. Barrington; gained the election by only *one*.
43 William Elliott, Secretary at the Castle.
44 General Eustace, a regiment.
45 Lord C. Fitzgerald, Duke of Leinster's brother; a pension and a peerage; a sea officer of no repute.
46 Right Hon. W. Forward, the brother of Lord Wicklow.
47 Sir C. Fortescue, renegaded officer; King at Arms.
48 A. Ferguson, got a place at the Barrack Board, 500*l.* a year, and a baronetcy.
*49 Luke Fox, appointed Judge of Common Pleas; nephew by marriage to Lord Ely.

*50 William Fortescue, got a secret pension out of a fund (3,000*l.* a year) entrusted by Parliament to the Irish Government, solely to reward Reynolds, Cope, &c., &c., and those who informed against rebels.
51 J. Galbraith, Lord Abercorn's attorney; got a baronetage.
52 Henry D. Grady, first counsel to the Commissioners.
53 Richard Hare, put two members into Parliament, and was created Lord Ennismore for their votes.
54 William Hare, his son.
55 Colonel B. Heniker, a regiment, and paid 3,500*l.* for his seat by the Commissioners of Compensation; an Englishman; got a peerage.
56 Peter Holmes, a Commissioner of Stamps.
57 George Hatton, appointed Commissioner of Stamps.
58 Hon. J. Hutchinson, a general, Lord Hutchinson.
59 Hugh Howard, Lord Wicklow's brother, made Postmaster General.
*60 William Handcock, Athlone, an extraordinary instance; he made and sang songs *against* the Union in 1799, at a public dinner of the Opposition, and made and sang songs *for* it in 1800; he got a peerage.
*61 John Hobson, appointed Storekeeper at the Castle Ordnance.
62 Col. G. Jackson, a regiment.
63 Denham Jephson, Master of Horse to the Lord Lieutenant.
64 Hon. G. Jocelyn, promotion in the Army, and his brother consecrated bishop of Lismore.
65 William Jones, Colonel of Militia.
66 Theophilus Jones, Collector of Dublin.
67 Maj.-Gen. Jackson, a regiment.
*68 William Johnson, returned to Parliament by Lord Castlereagh, as he himself declared, "to put an end to it;" appointed judge.
69 Robert Johnson, seceded from his patron, Lord Downshire, and was appointed a judge.
70 John Keane, a renegade; got a pension.
71 James Kearney, returned by Lord Clifton, being his attorney; got an office.
72 Henry Kemmis, son to the Crown Solicitor.
73 William Knott, appointed a Commissioner of Appeals, 800*l.* a year.
74 Andrew Knox, Lord Abercorn's influence.
*75 Colonel Keatinge.
76 Right Hon. Sir H. Langrishe, a Commissioner of the Revenue, received 15,000*l.* for his patronage at Knoctopher.
77 T. Lindsay, Commissioner of Stamps, paid 1,500*l.* for his patronage.
78 T. Lindsay, jun., Usher at the Castle, paid 1,500*l.* for his patronage.
79 T. Longfield, created a peer; Lord Longueville.
80 Capt. J. Longfield, appointed to the Office of Ship Entries of Dublin, taken from Sir Jonah Barrington.
81 Lord Loftus, son to Lord Ely, Postmaster-General; got 30,000*l.* for their boroughs, and created an English Marquis.
82 General Lake, an Englishman (no connexion with Ireland); returned by Lord Castereagh *solely* to vote for the Union.
83 Right Hon. David Latouche.

84 General Loftus, a general; got a regiment; cousin to Lord Ely.
85 Francis M'Namara, a private pension, paid by Lord Castlereagh.
86 Ross Mahon, several appointments and places by Government.
87 Richard Martin, Commissioner of Stamps.
88 Right Hon. Monk Mason, a Commissioner of Revenue.
89 H. D. Massy, received 4,000*l.*
*90 Thomas Mahon.
91 A. E. M'Naghten, appointed a Lord of the Treasury, &c.
92 Stephen Moore, a Postmaster at will.
*93 N. M. Moore.
94 Right Hon. Lodge Morris, created a peer.
95 Sir R. Musgrave, appointed Receiver of the Customs, 1,200*l.* a year.
96 James M'Cleland, a barrister; appointed Solicitor-General, and then a Baron of the Exchequer.
*97 Colonel C. M'Donnel, Commissioner of Imprest Accounts, 500*l.* per annum.
*98 Richard Magenniss, ditto.
99 Thomas Nesbit, a pensioner at will.
100 *Sir W. G. Newcomen, Bart.*, bought, and a peerage for his wife.
*101 Richard Neville, renegaded; reinstated as Teller of the Exchequer.
102 William Odell, a regiment, and Lord of the Treasury.
103 Charles Osborne, a barrister, appointed a Judge of the King's Bench.
104 C. M. Ormsby, appointed First Council Commissioner.
105 Admiral Packenham, Master of the Ordnance.
*106 Colonel Packenham, a regiment, killed at New Orleans.
*107 H. S. Prittie, a peerage, Lord Dunally.
*108 R. Penefather.
*109 T. Prendergast, an office in the Court of Chancery, 500*l.* a year, his brother Crown Solicitor.
*110 Sir Richard Quin, a peerage.
111 Sir Boyle Roche, Gentleman Usher at the Castle.
112 R. Rutledge.
*113 Hon. C. Rowley, renegaded, and appointed to office by Lord Castlereagh.
114 Hon. H. Skeffington, Clerk of the Paper Office of the Castle, and 7,500*l.* for his patronage.
115 William Smith, a barrister, appointed a Baron of Exchequer.
116 H. M. Sandford, created a peer, Lord Mount Sandford.
117 Edmond Stanley, appointed Commissioner of Accounts.
118 John Staples.
119 John Stewart, appointed Attorney-General, and created a baronet.
120 John Stratton.
*121 *Hon. B. Stratford*, renegaded to get 7,500, his half of the compensation for Baltinglass.
*122 *Hon. J. Stratford*, Paymaster of Foreign Forces, 1,300*l.* a year, and 7,500*l.* for Baltinglass.
*123 Richard Sharkey, an obscure barrister, appointed a county judge.
*124 *Thomas Stannus*, renegaded.
*125 J. Savage.
*126 Right Hon. J. Toler, Attorney-General, his wife, an old lady, created a peeress, himself made Chief Justice, and a peer.

*127 Frederick Trench, appointed a Commissioner of the Board of Works.
*128 Hon. R. Trench, a barrister, created a peer, and made an ambassador.
*129 Charles Trench, his brother appointed Commissioner of Inland Navigation, a new office created by Lord Cornwallis, for rewards.
*130 Richard Talbot.
*131 P. Tottenham, compensation for patronage, cousin, and politically connected with Lord Ely.
132 Lord Tyrone, 104 offices in the gift of his family; proposed the Union in Parliament, by a speech written in the crown of his hat.
133 Charles Tottenham, in office.
134 John Townsend, a Commissioner.
*135 Robert Tighe, Commissioner of Barracks.
136 Robert Uniack, a commissioner; connected with Lord Clare.
137 James Verner, called the Prince of Orange.
138 J. O. Vandeleur, commissioner of the Revenue; his brother a Judge.
139 Colonel Wemyss, Collector of Kilkenny.
140 Henry Westenra, father of the late Lord Rossmore, the reverse of him in politics.

It may not be uninteresting to refer to the two great leading men of the day, who, on the subject of the Union, widely differed. Mr. Fox had assisted in the establishment of the Independent Constitution of Ireland in 1782, and was adverse to a change. But with a view to forward the measure, his opponents had represented his sentiments as favourable to it; and, in consequence, at a meeting of the Whig Club in London, on the 6th May, 1800, he took the opportunity of explaining them. He said—

That he had persisted in his retirement from Parliament from no motive, but a persuasion on his part that his attendance would be of no avail—his opinions had been misrepresented, particularly on the Union. It had been invidiously given out, both in this country and in Ireland, that he was rather friendly than adverse to that measure—it was unnecessary to repeat his opinions to such men as were well acquainted with him. He, who had opposed the enslaving of America, must be hostile to the enslaving of Ireland. (Loud applause.) He, who thought it was unpardonable presumption, in this country, to attempt to

legislate for America, would not change his opinions of legislating for Ireland in Great Britain. It was the most arrogant of all pretensions, to pretend that we can legislate for Ireland—that we should understand all her local interests better than herself, and feel a more lively anxiety in promoting them—the sovereignty of the people—that man shall be his own governor, is the fundamental principle of all well constituted states. It is unnecessary to say more than to compare this principle with the Union, in order to discover the injustice of the measure. Does any one think, when the Union takes place, that Ireland will have an equal share in the Government? "Do as you will be done by," is one of the soundest maxims of policy. Put the question the other way: suppose England were to surrender up her legislature to unite herself with Ireland, and send one hundred members to the Irish Parliament, to sit there and act as the guardians of the interests of this country. If such a proposition was made, what would be the first outcry here against such a surrender of our independence: such a sacrifice of our interests, even if Ireland were to have an equal share in the British legislature, an outcry would be raised. What would the English say if the members for Belfast and Limerick were to have the ruling voice in legislating for them? To undertake to legislate for persons with whose local interests we must be unacquainted is despotism, not liberty. We could not have the same feeling, the same views with Ireland, and the attempt to govern for them was the most audacious which the history of mankind recorded. To pretend that the measure is taken with the consent of the Irish people is adding mockery to injury. While martial law* is proclaimed in Ireland, and the people restrained from meeting to express their sentiments, it is insulting them to say that the Union is made with their free good-will.

These were Mr. Fox's opinions on the measure of Union; they were worthy of a great mind, and a man of enlarged sentiments, and in both these respects there appears a great difference between him and his rival, and many think that

* When the disturbances in 1798 broke out in Ireland, he said to Mr. Grattan, "your countrymen have got into a great scrape, and I do not see how they can get out of it."

in these respects he greatly surpassed him. A comparison, therefore, of the respective merits of these celebrated men, may not prove uninteresting or unimportant.

Mr. Pitt—who may be said to be the author of Ireland's degradation, and the cause of her heaviest calamities—was the son of the great Earl of Chatham. In his early days he was distinguished for his literary acquirements, and was reputed to be one of the best classical scholars in England. He came into public life with great advantages; the splendour of his father's name shone around him, and he enjoyed the reputation of hereditary talent and popular principles; for his conduct, at the commencement of his career, induced men to believe that he would prove to be a staunch supporter of the rights and liberties of the people, as well as the power and prerogatives of the Crown.

As a speaker, Mr. Pitt was excellent—he had been trained in the art from his infancy by his father—he spoke very often, and never ill; Mr. Fox spoke often, and not always well, yet when he spoke from his heart, he was superior to Pitt; but in reply, Mr. Pitt was always good and superior to Fox, though not equal to Sheridan, whose invective was very bitter, and who was a man of the greatest genius in the House of Commons. Sheridan used to annoy Pitt more than any one else, and it is probable that on a field day Sheridan would have surpassed him, for he could make him appear very ridiculous;* but in close fight, Pitt always supported himself with prudence and sufficient boldness. He had great powers of satire; his fort was scorn; his invec-

* Mr. Grattan used to say that the difference between Lord Chatham and his son was, that you remembered what the one said, but not what the other.

tive was almost unrivalled, and did not seem to be so much the result of a warm imagination as the effect of his judgment; but he had not the depth or the grandeur of Fox. It is true that in his speeches Fox used to go very far; he went beyond what was prudent, and hazarded bold and extreme opinions. He did so in 1789; he did so in 1796. The race of his eloquence hurried him forward and precipitated him; there was a bold, constitutional vehemence of mind, which made him sacrifice his cooler judgment. Its nobleness captivated. When he conversed, he opened his heart before you—when he spoke, his language was select, his words well chosen; he sometimes made too much of a small subject; but when his mind lightened, he was prodigiously fine—nothing could be superior. He possessed more talent and more general knowledge than Pitt, but he had not his art. Pitt was an actor, but, unlike his father, he was a trickster also. He had a better understanding than Fox, but he wanted what Fox had—a heart! He was too cautious, and would have been a greater man if he had had less artifice. His speaking resembled a square battalion, or a number of battalions, each supporting the other; his arguments were always well arranged, and followed and strengthened each other. It was not so with Fox. His fault was that his arguments did not seem to flow from each other; it was a large army, but deficient in order; but Pitt lacked the ornament that Fox had, which, however, was in argument, and not always used; neither did he possess the same reach of mind as Fox, nor the same magnanimity of sentiment. When men heard Pitt* speak, they heard what was very good and finely delivered,

* Sheridan used to say that Pitt was like a pendulum—he never thought till his tongue was set in motion.

but when they heard Fox they heard much that was ordinary, and some things that were unrivalled. Pitt's speeches are models of parliamentary debating, and good speaking; they flow with great ease—there is no break, no sudden conclusion, nothing abrupt; they contain much grandeur of style; they have propriety, sense, and dignity, and an easy continued flow, but they want brilliancy, vivacity, and impetus; they will not descend to posterity, and will scarcely be read, for the subjects cease to interest, and there is no rich sentiment or philosophical principle in them. They are nothing compared to his father's —they are nothing compared to Bolingbroke, and even Bolingbroke is not often read. Demosthenes will ever be read on account of his fine style and fine sentiments, though the subject does not interest. Pitt's speeches on the Regency question excite no interest—(that, as was very improperly said by Sheridan, was a question of party)—his speeches on the Indian question are good, but inferior to Burke's, where that subject will be studied; inferior also to Fox, who spoke on that question better than Pitt. His speech on the breaking out of the French war, after the peace of Amiens, was Pitt's best, but it was ill reported, as the gallery was cleared. Fox replied next day, and told Mr. Grattan it was the best speech he ever made.

Of these two great statesmen, Mr. Fox was decidedly the first—he possessed finer principles, and appears a nobler but a looser* character. Mr. Pitt will be thought to have more prudence, but he was spoiled by Government, and had received a bad education from his early connection with the Court, where he had learned harsh principles and tricky ways. On the other hand, Mr.

* Coming from the Italian he would have sung the Beggar's Opera.

Fox stood aloof from the Court, and was brought up differently, though irregularly, but was spoiled by being too long in opposition, as Mr. Pitt was by being too long in Government; yet, considering how long Pitt remained in power, and the means he had to increase it, it is surprising he was not a much worse and a more arbitrary minister. He had the art to keep clear of faults, and exposed himself to few, while he took advantage of all those of his adversary, so that he may justly be called "*tectissimus orator*;" but this was not a great art, and did not evince any great quality, and there is no fine principle in it. Pitt was cunning, always afraid of being overreached, and sure to sow distrust in every bosom. He did so with Mr. Grattan and the Volunteers in 1783—he did so with Mr. Grattan and Lord Fitzwilliam in the negotiation of 1795—he did so with respect to both Catholics and Protestants at the Union in 1800. Fox was exactly the reverse; he had an engaging manner, a directitude and openness of character that inspired confidence; he possessed the art of approximation, and in a question of negotiation would come sooner to the object, and had talent to manage it. Great fault was found with Fox for his coalition with Lord North in '83; but the coalition of Pitt with George the Third afterwards was infinitely worse. Fox's junction with Lord North may have been unseemly, but nothing more. Fox and he had been political opponents, but Fox was minister and Lord North was not; he took office under Fox. But Pitt formed a coalition with the King, and took office under him—the one was the Government of a constitutional minister directing a man already humbled by defeat, the other was the league of an exasperated king against a constitutional minister. The King had lost one Em-

pire, and would have gone on in the mad attempt to recover it, if he had been permitted to follow his own inclination. Pitt joined with him, and formed a most unprincipled junction, in which he consulted his animosity against Fox more than his love for the country. Pitt took office *under* the old offenders,* and a very bad party; and the King took up an aspiring young man against Fox, and Pitt managed the King by threatening *to let loose Fox upon him.* This terror kept Pitt in office till he found he was making the King too strong; the King then discovered he could do without him, and turned him out.† It was singular that the people should have seen the junction between Fox and Lord North, and not have seen the junction between Pitt and the King. Though the doctrine that the King should not name as minister a man whom Parliament disapproves, is not very constitutional, yet it is useful. In 1784, Pitt opposed this fatally; his father had thought differently, and said that the King should be restrained in the choice of his minister, and kept him so. Pitt dissolved the charm, and took *the King out of leading strings.* Pitt gave many bad qualities to the King, who kept them, and in exchange he got bad ones from the King, and never returned them.

On the subject of the Regency, perhaps Pitt was right; the ground he took was more prudent and more popular than that taken by Mr. Fox; and yet he would have found it difficult to reconcile it to the spirit of the British constitution. There was no analogy to it in his doctrine, which went much farther from the principles of the constitution than that of Mr. Fox.

Mr. Fox (who on the question of the Middlesex election had begun ill in supporting its prin-

* 1784. † 1801.

ciple, namely, the right of the House of Commons to disqualify its members), on the question of the Regency supported the right of the Prince of Wales to become Regent on the illness of his father, the King. Of this error Mr. Pitt availed himself dexterously, and acquired great popularity. He managed the question with consummate skill, and gained the people by professing to defend the Constitution against Fox, while he gained the King by defending him against his son. It was certainly more dangerous to let the House of Commons assume the power than the Prince, for then they might declare the King incapable, and form a Republic. The case was an extreme one, and could only be provided for on the occasion; there was no great light thrown on the subject. Mr. Pitt's phrase of "*Treason to the Constitution*" sounded well, but had no strength. He admitted that the Prince should be Regent; Fox said the same; they differed only about the mode; that was matter of arrangement, and in this Pitt showed a factious spirit. He deprived the Regent of the appointments to the household, which he gave to the Queen, whom he had on his side, and of whose friendship he was sure: thus he created a party for himself, so that he could not be turned out of office; or, if he was turned out, he possessed through this party the greatest possible means of annoying the Regent. On the whole of the business there was a great deal of faction.* The Prince did not act well; he held private meetings, when he should have left London, and shown no anxiety or concern in the case further than that which

* On the debate on the same subject at a subsequent period, Sheridan said the whole was a question of party; his friends did not forgive him. But this did not apply to Ireland where it was not a party question, and in which the Irish Parliament acted in a much more constitutional manner than the British.

he should have entertained concerning his father. The Parliament of Ireland on this occasion differed from Mr. Pitt; they made him their enemy by taking part with the Prince of Wales against him. Mr. Pitt never forgave them, but harboured the recollection in his breast till an opportunity occurred. The Union was an act of resentment, and he then wreaked upon that devoted country all his vengeance, with cool, unsparing malevolence.

He took up the question of Reform in Parliament, and the reformation of abuses, and then he abandoned them. Having availed himself of the popularity they acquired for him to get into power; he then forgot the principle—the Reform he found a legacy left by his father, and he used it, not for the people, but as a weapon against Mr. Fox, and then flung it away as soon as he became minister. He acted the part of an apostate, and his office was his apology; but he went a little farther, and strove to hang those who had supported these measures. He made an attack upon the Constitution, and put on their trial the persons who had formerly been his friends. He had lived with Dr. Price and Horne Tooke in habits of intimacy—he had adopted the principles of the one, enjoyed the friendship of the other, and then strove to hang both. It may be said that he stopped the dissemination of Jacobin principles in England, but he did so by desperate measures, and most unconstitutional proceedings; and if the offences of Hardy and Tooke had been declared treason, no man in England would have been safe.

With regard to the abolition of the slave trade, he professed to be its supporter, yet he remained in office without carrying it—he did more, for he allowed his own men to consider it as a private

question, and let them vote as they pleased: thus, he held office to let his own party vote against him, and outvote him on his own question. This was a palpable trick, and the introduction of a practice that was novel and bad.

With respect to the French war, Pitt supported and Fox opposed it. Both were in the wrong—both went too far; the one was too ready to make peace, the other too eager to continue the war. Pitt was mistaken, in 1792, for he should have made peace then. France had been foiled; she had lost Brabant and the Low Countries, and was more limited in territory than at the peace of 1814. The object, therefore, which Mr. Pitt professed to have in view was obtained, and he should have terminated the war. He approved afterwards of the peace of 1801, and this was a confession that he was wrong in 1792; but his idea was not merely to beat down France, but to beat down all French principles everywhere. That was absurd, and showed he was a bad statesman, as well as a bad war-minister; but he was a sterling Englishman, and his merit was, that he restrained the wild spirit that was extending from France, and kept up the national spirit of England. He did this with great boldness and great perseverance, and not only kept up the high tone of England, but made her the rallying-point for Europe; and it may be fairly said, that he upheld the courage of the Continent, as well as that of his own country. He was, however, greatly assisted by Edmund Burke. This was his merit, and he deserves praise for it; but when that is said, everything is said. His plans got credit subsequently from the defeat of the French, and obtained for his memory a praise that he did not deserve; for the success of the war was owing to

the reverse of his system. *He* had nothing to say to it; Buonaparte achieved it—not England.

Fox's fault was that he appeared too eager to conclude peace on any terms, and he was censured for this much more than he deserved; the truth was that he saw farther than Pitt did, and was right in the two prophecies that he made that France would beat Europe and could only be ruined by herself; he said justly, "*if France is thrown on her resources she will beat us, but if she throws the Continent on their resources she will be beaten.*" This turned out to be the case. Pitt proved the truth of the first proposition, for he submitted to terms of peace harder than were offered to England, and that left France mistress of Europe. The event proved the truth of the second proposition. France beat herself down; the expedition to Russia ruined her; Pitt's wars made her; Buonaparte's wars destroyed her. Fox may have committed many errors, but here he foretold precisely what happened, and sufficient justice has not been rendered to his memory. If he had lived, he would have made peace in 1807; he had obtained good terms, and would have brought matters to a favourable termination; but he was dying.

Let us see for what Pitt deserves the name of great: he could have derived little satisfaction from anything that he did, except it was a satisfaction to find the country everything and to leave her nothing; perhaps he may have been elated by his measures of finance. Commerce grew into a flourishing state, notwithstanding the loss of the American market, and here he had some merit. As to the French revolution, he prevented its principles from spreading to England, but he did this by desperate means, and

the Emperor of Austria did the same. His conceptions may have been good, but his execution was miserable. He failed in all his military undertakings; his expeditions were unfortunate and unsuccessful. He placed at their head the King's son, because he was his son, not because he was a general. His coalitions were ill-planned, accelerated, and ineffectual.* His continental projects failed; he could not carry parliamentary reform; he could not carry the abolition of the slave trade; he could not carry Catholic emancipation; he could not conclude a peace with France; he could only make war in Ireland, and carry his Union by bayonets and bribes. His bank restriction was condemned by his friend Canning; his sinking fund by his friend Lord Grenville.

The panegyric of his followers was his disparagement; for if he had been a truly great man he never would have associated with them. They undervalued Lord Chatham, and for opposite reasons praised the son. Had he been what he ought they would not have extolled him; but Mr. Pitt liked that class of persons, and was fond of "*a diligent mediocrity.*" On the whole, he failed in the two grand efforts of his life—the French war and the Irish Union; his professed object was to consolidate the two countries, whereas the people remained as divided as ever. His rival would never have passed such a measure. Mr. Fox had a superior mind; he had also an excellent heart, and was perhaps the best natured

* The public paper transmitted to Mr. Pitt from abroad, stated the number of troops the allies were to bring into the field, and after particularizing the contingents of each state, ended with "*et d'autres*, 30,000!" and these paper men seemed to suffice for the British minister; England paid for them accordingly, and Buonaparte scattered them to the winds.

man that ever lived. He wrote to General Burgoyne in 1783 about the Irish Volunteers, so also did Mr. Pitt; his letters were kind and feeling, —those of Mr. Pitt were harsh and angry. Fox was full of candour; he had great weaknesses, was often mistaken in politics, and had many errors, but they did not impeach his political principles, though they did his prudence. Pitt, on the contrary, associated and went to table with men of vile principles—Jenkinson, Eldon, Westmoreland. What could be more insincere than his professions? What more unconstitutional than his government? What more desperate, profligate, and violent than his Irish administration? His fault—nay his *crime*—was that his government left on the minds of the people a hostile impression towards England.

When men call him great they should not forget his conduct—flogging, strangling, and free-quarters. If he had been a great man he would not have allowed such measures. It may be doubted whether he was a bad minister for England, but no one can doubt that he was a bad minister for Ireland; he kept up there an abominable set of men, and it cannot any longer be questioned whether he was justified in giving that country up to a band of fiery fiends such as Lord Clare, John Claudius Beresford, Archbishop Agar, Hobart, Westmoreland, and Camden—the pitch-cap, the triangle, the lash, and the torture. There is a good plain way of judging of ministers, that is, from the persons they employ, and if Pitt had been truly great he never would have tolerated such men or pursued such measures. He found Ireland in a very different state from that to which he reduced her. His father did not think it requisite to keep up such a military force

there as his son rendered necessary. It was not required at the time of the American war. It was not required at the period of 1782, there were then only 5,000 troops in Ireland; it was scarcely required even at the period of 1796; but Mr. Pitt lost by his violent measures the affections of the Irish people, he shook the connection, he perilled the empire, and his conduct towards Ireland left a stain upon his character that never will be effaced.

CHAPTER VII.

After the Union Mr. Grattan retires to Tinnehinch and gives up politics.—His mode of life.—Letter to Mr. Berwick.—Remark on Lord Clare's speech in the Imperial Parliament.—Lord Fitzwilliam urges Mr. Grattan to enter Parliament.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Signor Acerbi.—Remarks on Ireland.—Mr. Pitt and Lord Cornwallis retire from office.—Their reasons.—Memorandum produced by Lord Castlereagh on the subject.—Mr. Addington's administration.—Peace with the French Republic.—Emmett's insurrection in 1803.—His words and death.—The Broken Heart, Moore's Melody.—Mr. M'Can's examination before the Privy Council.—Strange offers to him.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Mr. Wickham.—The paper regarding the United Irish Directory burned by Mr. Grattan.—Lord Fitzwilliam's letter to Mr. Grattan and Mr. Plowden.—His History and Remarks on Mr. Addington as to the Catholics.—Mr. Fox applies to Mr. Grattan on the affairs of Ireland.—His answer.—His yeomanry corps.—Reconciles Orangemen and Catholics.—Mr. Grattan's important letter to Mr. Fox.—Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan.—Hardy's Memoirs of Lord Charlemont.

After the Union, Mr. Grattan retired to Tinnehinch, and gave himself up to study and to the education of his children. His love of literature and of music afforded him great and lasting resources; he returned to the study of Greek and Latin classics, and the English, Irish, and Roman histories. Horace, Virgil, Homer, Livy, Tacitus, Cicero, and Demosthenes, Shakspeare, Milton, and Pope were his favourite authors; he had them always on the table and much of them by heart. About a mile from Tinnehinch there was an ancient Roman Catholic churchyard, situated on a rising ground above the Waterfall river; the remains of the ruined walls

were overhung with ivy, and the old trees that grew around them covered the place with a grave and solemn shade, it was a lonely but an interesting spot; along its border lay a little dell through which a brook murmured gently round moss-grown stones, till a few yards farther on, it fell over a steep cascade, and there joined the river that flowed to Tinnehinch. This was the favourite retreat of Mr. Grattan; to this sequestered spot he loved to retire, and on the Sunday mornings in spring, when the wild violets and the primroses began to appear, and in summertide, he used to sit or saunter beneath the blossoming hawthorn, wrapt in thought and meditation; there, he would say, it is not within a church alone that I can offer up my prayers to Heaven; God is visible in all his works around, wondrous and infinite; I behold, I admire, and I adore. My brother* and myself, who often accompanied him, used then to read or to repeat some favourite author, till the hour for breakfast aroused him to return. He could scarce speak tranquilly on the subject of the Union; at one time he would start into fits as if seized with frenzy, at another he would remain musing and melancholy, or if he ventured to speak on the subject his eyes almost filled with tears.

His habits were early, and as he was now freed from the turmoil of politics, he could regulate them with more precision. He rose at six, threw over his shoulders his House of Commons cloak, and went from the bedroom to the river and therein he precipitated himself, summer or winter, frost or snow; his health was thus restored, and his spirits in some degree recovered their former tone and elasticity. He kept to his early friends, Hardy, Berwick, Ponsonby, Arthur

* The Right Hon. James Grattan, member for the county of Wicklow.

Moore, Preston (the poet), Burrowes, Fletcher, Curran, the remnant of the Irish party, with whom, as he was wont to say, he had retired from the scenes of their last labours, "*with safe consciences but with breaking hearts.*"

But Mr. Grattan, though sensitive in the highest degree,* was a man too intellectual, too favoured in friendship and love, and too good to fall into misanthropy or stupor under any misfortunes. The following letter to one of his closet friends, though short and slight, shows that his mind was strong, as the after one from Lord Fitzwilliam is evidence of his bodily health, and of the unabated esteem with which every honest politician regarded him:—

MR. GRATTAN TO THE REV. MR. BERWICK.

30th March, 1801.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I return you many thanks; present my acknowledgments to Mr. Davenport† in my name, but I have got a tutor, Mr. M'Neil has agreed to come. I long to see you and talk about the times. I have not seen Hardy for some time, he is with the Bishop;‡ as soon as my horse recovers I will ride to them. I am glad you are likely to be on friendly terms with La Touche;§ he is a man of great worth, though his politics fall short a little

* An anecdote may here be related, which to some families may prove useful and instructive. When very young Mr. Grattan had been frightened by stories of ghosts and hobgoblins that nurses are too often in the habit of relating to children, so much so as to affect his nerves in the greatest degree; he could not bear being left alone, or remaining long without any person in the dark. This feeling he determined to overcome, and he adopted a bold plan. In the dead of night he used to resort to a churchyard near his father's house, and there he used to sit upon the gravestones, while the perspiration poured down his face; but by these efforts he at length succeeded and overcame his nervous sensation; this certainly was a strong proof of courage in a child.

† Rev. Mr. Davenport, a Fellow of Dublin College, a very worthy man.

‡ Dickson, Bishop of Down, a mild, upright, honest man, who with Marley voted against the Union—the only two bishops who did so.

§ Right Hon. David Latouche, he had voted for the Union; one of the only seven men in the house who were not bribed.

of ours. What do you think of Lord Clare's* last speech —the *mite Thaletis ingenium?* He seems to me to have become a clumsy affectation of Dr. Duigenan. Remember me to the house of Castle Forbes.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

LORD FITZWILLIAM TO MR. GRATTAN.

London, June 11th, 1801.

DEAR GRATTAN,—Though no occasion has offered for my expressing to you the interest I have taken in, and the gratification I have received from, all the happy circumstances that have attended you since we last met, not one of your numerous friends has seen them with more sincere pleasure. In the midst of circumstances of a different nature, health, I am happy to hear, has returned, and with it, I hope, not only the powers, but the inclination for activity. You must not be buried in the mountains of Wicklow, nor deprive the country of talents in which it has a property. Let me then ask you if you will accept a seat in the present Parliament should a vacancy arise by a death. My friend, Mr. Dainer, who sits for Peterborough, is in a very precarious state; I trust he will recover, but there is much danger that he will not. If anything happens to him, I can venture to promise you an election, without opposition. I should not make a proposal to you to stop a gap at the fag end of a Parliament if I had it

* The speech that Mr. Grattan here alludes to was delivered in the House of Lords on the 23rd of March, on the Irish Martial Law Bill; it was full of false statements, gross misrepresentations, and the most virulent abuse upon the people of Ireland.

He appears to have stated that the Catholic question was first brought forward in Ireland for the purpose of rebellion, and that ninety-nine out of every hundred Catholics did not care one jot for Catholic Emancipation; what they wanted and understood by emancipation was a partition of property! He said that every night when he retired to his chamber, he retired to an armoury; and every day when he went out of his house, his servant as regularly handed him his pistols as he did his hat!

The proof of this last falsehood was, that he resided in Ireland, which he would not have done if what he stated were true; for he possessed much more of the feminine quality than the heroic. On one occasion, as some troops were passing in the streets of Dublin to relieve a military guard, the people, in making way for them, pressed upon Lord Clare who was walking by; he conceived they were going to attack him and grew frightened, he ran into a shop and drew out a pistol to defend himself. Curran said that when he fought him he was as pale as death.

not in my power to propose to you a seat in the *next* without opposition; and I wish it to be understood to be under all circumstances, whether a vacancy shall now take place or not. In either case allow me to propose it to you, and to press your acceptance, as a gratification to my pride in showing the *existence* of mutual confidence.—Believe me, with the sincerest esteem, most truly yours,

WENTWORTH FITZWILLIAM.

The reply to this could not be procured, but the offer was not accepted.

The individual to whom the following letter was addressed was an Italian, who came on a visit to Ireland and was introduced to Mr. Grattan. He was the author of a tour in Lapland, and came to write a tour in Ireland. He was a man of sense, spirit, and observation, passionately fond of music, a player and composer; this secured him a warm reception among the inmates of Tinnehinch, in honour to whom he composed some pretty pieces of music. The letter is interesting, it shows the state of the people of Ireland with rare compactness and Mr. Grattan's opinion:—

MR. GRATTAN TO SIGNOR ACERBI.

Tinnehinch, December 17th, 1801.

MY DEAR SIGNOR,—I was glad to hear from you and of you, in whatever quarter of the globe you are, whether the North Pole or the Torrid Zone, I shall be delighted to receive your letters. The north of Ireland contains the active citizens of Ireland; its principal wealth, industry, and spirit; a bad climate and a fine people; the south is more beautiful but worse peopled; the cause is moral and not physical. The trade of the south was forbidden, the trade of the north encouraged. The trade of the former consisting of woollen cloth, was an object of jealousy to England; the trade of the other consisting of linen, which was not. The emigration you mention is shocking; it seems we lose our people as we lose our constitution. America may rejoice, France may rejoice. I am not surprised that those of whom you speak should repent of

their late conduct; there is no constitution to be resisted now, no liberty to be run down now, and therefore no use for them. It is a fact that in this country since the wolves have been destroyed, the wolf-dog has perished. I agree with you that the expense of attending the English Parliament is more than the Irish fortunes can bear; the members will in general settle in England, or cease to attend, or get public plunder for their votes in Parliament. I can well conceive what you write of the peace to be the fact; a bad peace is better than a bad war. I was glad of the peace principally for this reason, it secured our country from invasion. I am glad the Cisalpine republic is secured; mention to me what her constitution is to be; at present I apprehend it is a municipality, chosen by certain description of people, making laws, and executing them. I should wish her constitution more open than that of France or Holland; that she should have a representation chosen by the people who have some property, for I don't like personal representation, it is anarchy, and must become slavery. I would have a Senate and a House of Representatives; the latter should be biennial, the former of a longer continuance. As to the Pope, I suppose Buonaparte in his Concordat (I have not seen it) consulted the wishes of France, and his own power, of course. The church in France may be restored, but the empire of the church never; its roots are gone, its tithes, its domination. Buonaparte seems to think that the religion of the people should be that of the Government; I fancy he is right; but with us there are many who think that the religion of the Government should be that of the people; I think they are wrong, because the people may have some religion, the Government seldom has any. I lament that I cannot find your book or journal. The letter of Hawkins was of no consequence. Remember us to Signore Bellotti and to Tom if you see him. I shall thank you much for the Statistical Breviary. I am happy you have fixed with your printer, I long to see your journal, and am, believe me, with the greatest sincerity, yours most affectionately,

HENRY GRATTAN.

In March 1801, Mr. Pitt retired from office, and a change of administration took place. The cause assigned was, that no further concessions to the Catholics of Ireland would be granted by the

King; the consequence was the formation of a ministry on the principle of total and final exclusion. This appears from the letter of Mr. Plowden, who was employed by the Government to write on the subject of Ireland, and who states the conversation and the expressions of Mr. Addington, which sufficiently showed the spirit of the Administration.

Thus early did the Union bubble burst. Not only had the King been too strong for his ministers, and determined to govern against their advice, but he had resolved to govern against the sense of his people. Mr. Pitt and Lord Cornwallis conceiving themselves bound to the Catholics, thought proper to retire, and they put forward two important documents, setting forth the reasons for their resignation, advising the Catholics, and delivering an opinion favourable to their claims. These were *drawn up by Lord Castlereagh,* and given by Lord Cornwallis to Dr. Troy, the titular R. C. Archbishop of Dublin, with a view to satisfy the people of Ireland that some exertion had been made on their behalf. The production of these documents at this juncture was a proof that ministers had made use of the Catholic question as a means of accomplishing the Union; the refusal on the part of the King was pleaded as an excuse for leaving office, and intended not only as an apology for their conduct on the Union, but as a complete discharge from all future obligations; for (although the words of the document state the minister pledged not to embark in the service of Government unless on the terms of the Catholic privileges being obtained) both these individuals put upon them an interpretation quite different from their plain meaning, and took office afterwards without any stipulation to carry the measure. Surely if there had been an insurmountable bar to hold office, it

existed in 1804,* as well as in 1801, and therefore resignation at one period should have been a bar to acceptance of office at the other; but Mr. Pitt went even farther than this; for in the debate of 1805, he stated that the cause of his resignation had operated so strongly on his mind, that he never would be a party *to bringing forward the measure* on any future occasion (evidently alluding to the enmity of the King). It is manifest that these papers were intended to cover his retreat, and that of Lord Cornwallis, from a very inglorious and disgraceful proceeding. In the debate in 1805, the words used by the minister were, that he gave no *direct* pledge to the Catholics, but he distinctly violated the written pledge given in the following document, of what sort soever it was really meant to be. On the whole, it was a ministerial manœuvre very little creditable to any party—a species of jugglery in which, if the minister contrived not to break his word, he went as near to it as he could; and the only difference seemed to be between a person not deceiving you, but suffering you to deceive yourself. Mr. Cooke's letter, and the memorandum by Lord Cornwallis, as produced by Lord Castlereagh in his speech on the Catholic question on the 25th of May, 1810, are prefixed to the documents, as they appertain to them, and illustrate the transactions of 1801. It is observable that it was on the 13th of February of that year, *scarce six months subsequent to the passing the act of Union,* that these proceedings occurred, Lord Castlereagh having then applied to Lord Cornwallis for the documents.

Dublin Castle, March 3rd, 1801.

My dear Lord,—In answer to the queries stated in

* Mr. Pitt accepted office in May, 1804.

your lordship's letter to the Lord Lieutenant of the 26th instant, his Excellency has directed me to inclose to you the statement which accompanies this letter, and which has been prepared according to his Excellency's directions. I am ever, my dear Lord, most truly, your Lordship's servant,

E. COOKE.

Viscount Castlereagh, &c. &c.

MEMORANDUM.

WHEN it was notified to the Lord Lieutenant that Mr. Pitt, Lord Grenville, Lord Spencer, Lord Camden, Mr. Dundas, and Mr. Windham, had requested permission to retire from his Majesty's councils, upon their not being sanctioned in bringing forward *such measures as they thought essential to secure to the empire the full benefit of the Union, the most important of which measures was a concession of further privileges to his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects,* his Excellency conceived that it was expedient that the Catholic body should have an authentic communication upon a subject so deeply affecting their situation and interests, and so calculated to influence their future conduct.

His Excellency *had long held it as his private opinion, that the measure intended* by those of his Majesty's ministers who were retiring from office was necessary for securing the connection of Ireland with Great Britain. He had been, however, cautious in his language on the subject, and had studiously avoided any declaration to the Catholics, on which they could raise an expectation that their wishes were to be conceded. Through the whole measure of the Union, which was in discussion for two years, and during which period every effort was made to procure a resistance to the measure on the part of the whole body of the Catholics, no favourable assurance or promise was made to them.

Their judicious conduct, during that trying period, confirmed his Excellency in the opinion, that every measure tending to secure their attachment to the empire in future, which they had in this instance so essentially served, ought in true policy to be attempted.

His Excellency did, therefore, recommend it to his chief secretary, who was engaged with his Majesty's ministers in the course of the summer in England, to second every

disposition for effecting the object of the Catholics, at the same time he retained a prudential reserve to the Catholics during the progress of the discussions of the cabinet.

His Majesty having approved of the solicitation of the majority of his Majesty's ministers to retire from his Majesty's councils, his Excellency having requested that his Majesty would extend to him the same indulgence, it became a matter of public duty for his Excellency to explain to the Catholic body the sentiments which had been held with respect to them, and to inculcate the line of conduct which, in this arduous crisis, it became them to pursue.

His Excellency, therefore, being apprised of the sentiment held by Mr. Pitt, did, on the 13th February, send for Lord Fingal and Dr. Troy, and gave them two papers, to be by them circulated among the principal Catholics in different parts of Ireland.

The first, his Excellency felt assured, corresponded with Mr. Pitt's sentiments.

And the other conveyed his own private sentiments, formed on the speeches and conduct of many of the most eminent characters of all parties and distinctions.

It being of great importance that any communication made by his Excellency should not be misunderstood or misinterpreted, and that it should make a due impression and produce a general good effect, his Excellency preferred a written to a mere verbal communication; which might have been ill reported, and might have been subject to perversion, according to the inclination or capacity of those who should circulate and receive it.

His Excellency has seen a happy result from this mode of proceeding. Rumours having been transmitted from England that the wishes of the Catholics were likely to be acceded to, every ill consequence from their disappointment has been obviated: and there is now every reason to believe that they will take that line of conduct which the well-wishers to his Majesty's service and the cause of the empire could desire.

THE FOLLOWING WERE MR. PITT'S SENTIMENTS.

The leading part of his Majesty's ministers, finding insurmountable obstacles to the bringing forward measures of concession to the Catholic body whilst in office, have felt it impossible to continue in administration under the inability to propose it with the circumstances necessary to e carrying the measure with all its advantages: and they

have retired from his Majesty's service, considering this line of conduct as most likely to contribute to its ultimate success. The Catholic body will therefore see how much their future hopes must depend upon strengthening their cause by good conduct: in the mean time, they will prudently consider their prospects as arising from the persons who may espouse their interests, and compare them with those which they may look to from any other quarter. They may, with confidence, rely on the support of all those who retire, *and of many who remain in office,* when it can be given with a prospect of success. They may be assured that Mr. Pitt will do his utmost to establish their cause in the public favour, and prepare the way for their finally attaining their objects:* and the Catholics will feel that, as Mr. Pitt could not concur in a hopeless attempt to force it now, he must at all times repress, with the same decision as if he held an adverse opinion, any unconstitutional conduct in the Catholic body.

Under these circumstances, it cannot be doubted that the Catholics will take the most loyal, dutiful, and patient line of conduct; that they will not suffer themselves to be led into measures which can, by any construction, give a handle to the opposers of their wishes,—either to misinterpret their principles, or to raise an argument for resisting their claims; but that, by their prudent and exemplary demeanour, they will afford additional grounds to the growing number of their advocates to enforce their claims, on proper occasions, until their objects can be finally and advantageously attained.

The Sentiments of a Sincere Friend (the Marquis Cornwallis) to the Catholic Claims.

If the Catholics should now proceed to violence, or entertain any idea of obtaining their objects by convulsive measures, or forming associations with men of jacobinical principles, they must of course lose the support and aid of those who have sacrificed their own situations in their

* "The sentiments contained in this paper Lord Cornwallis knew to be Mr. Pitt's, having been conveyed in a letter from Lord Castlereagh to his lordship, which letter *was previously seen and approved of by Mr. Pitt,* although not expressed precisely in the terms read in the paper." —Words of Lord Castlereagh, 25th May, 1810, Parliamentary Debates.

Yet who would have believed that in a few years afterwards Mr. Pitt should "without any pledge demanded from the King, have *voluntarily* "*engaged not to bring forward the question.*"—Lord Hawkesbury's Speech, March, 1807.

cause, but also would, at the same time, feel it their indispensable duty to oppose everything tending to confusion.

On the other hand, should the Catholics be sensible of the benefits they possess, by having so many characters of eminence *pledged not to embark in the service of Government, except on the terms of the Catholic privileges being obtained*, it is to be hoped that in balancing the advantages and disadvantages of their situation, they would prefer a quiet and peaceable demeanour to any line of conduct of an opposite description.

The strange proceeding of a retiring minister giving written explanations to popular parties, unconnected with him, of his party's reason for secession, produced, as Mr. Cook's letter shows, an inquiry from London; and this certainly somewhat negatives the conclusion suggested by parts of the documents, as well as from other circumstances, that the resignation of 1801 was only specious, that Mr. Pitt wanted to avoid the humiliating peace,* and to trick the Catholics. Lord Cornwallis's two papers display a far greater anxiety to keep the Catholics clients of his party, than to secure their liberty; and his statement in the memorandum, that "no favourable assurance or promise" was made to the Catholics during the Union discussions, is directly false, and is nega-

* The substance of the preliminaries of peace between the French Republic and Great Britain and Ireland, signed the 1st of October, 1801, was as follows:

Great Britain retained the islands of Ceylon in the East, and Trinidad in the West, Indies, restoring all the other French, Spanish, and Dutch possessions.

The Cape of Good Hope was to remain a free port; Malta was to be independent both of Great Britain and France, and to be restored to the order of St. John of Jerusalem, under the protection of a third power, to be agreed upon.

Egypt was to be restored to the Porte's dominions, which power, as well as those of Naples and Portugal, with some inconsiderable exceptions, were guaranteed in their full integrity, as they stood before the war; Naples and Rome were to be evacuated by the French, and Porto Ferrajo by the English troops.

tived by the heads of the administration. The most remarkable sentence in the series of documents is, that (in the "Memorandum") in Lord Cornwallis's private opinion, *Catholic emancipation was necessary for securing the connexion of Ireland and Great Britain.**

The new administration, formed in March, 1801, consisted of,

First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. Henry Addington.
President of the Council, Duke of Portland.
Lord Chancellor, Lord Eldon.
Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Westmoreland.
First Lord of the Admiralty, Earl St. Vincent.
Master General of the Ordnance, Earl of Chatham.
Secretary of State for the Home Department, Lord Pelham.
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Hawkesbury.
Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies, Lord Hobart.
President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India, Lord Viscount Lewisham.
Secretary at War, Right Hon. Charles Yorke.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Earl of Liverpool.
Treasurer of the Navy, Right Hon. Dudley Ryder (afterwards Lord Harrowby).
Joint Paymaster of His Majesty's Forces, Right Hon. Thomas Steele, Lord Glenbervie.
Joint Postmasters-General, Lord Auckland, Lord Charles Spencer.
Secretaries of the Treasury, John Hiley Addington, Esq., Nicholas Vansittart, Esq.
Master of the Rolls, Sir William Grant.
Attorney-General, Sir Edward Law (afterwards Lord Ellenborough).
Solicitor-General, Hon. Spencer Perceval.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Earl of Hardwicke.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Earl of Clare.
Chief Secretary for Ireland, Lord Castlereagh.
Chancellor of Exchequer for Ireland, Right Hon. Isaac Corry.

Robert Emmett's insurrection, though it originated from deeper sources than was generally alleged, was as perfect a surprise to Mr. Grattan as to any one in Ireland. The postscript of this letter to Mr. Berwick is his first expression of surprise, anger, and anxiety — anxiety for his

* Irish Emancipation may yet be found as urgently necessary as Catholic.

country. The worst evil of an unsuccessful insurrection is not the loss of life in battle, but the legal butchery and ferocious terrorism which follow it. The time of Emmett's insurrection was unfavourable to success. The first wrath against the Union had burst, the sober animosity, fated ultimately to destroy that Union, had scarcely begun. England's troops were disposable, and the organization of '97 broken; yet, with a leader of more profound and stern character, the attack on Dublin might have succeeded, and then the country would have risen and a national war would have followed. But the attempt threw back the country for years, and, only it was so trivial that men were enabled with some degree of success to laugh at it, that one night's *emeute* might have been fatal to every eminent patriot in Ireland.

MR. GRATTAN TO THE REV. MR. BERWICK.

25th July, 1803.

DEAR DOCTOR,—I agree with you about Thucydides, though I never read him deeply. Demosthenes being of your opinion is somewhat in its favour. I believe the Greek to be the best mode of writing. The best passage I ever read in Cicero is his praise of Demosthenes.

I hear nothing. There are rumours of Lord Moira coming in—it is an anxious time. I am happy that Lady Moira is so well. I shall drink her health to-day—I dine with Curran, who always gives her. Stocks low, taxes high—both parties talking like fools, French and English. Mrs. G. is much better. I am happy to hear that you, and your children, and Mrs. Berwick are well.—Yours, &c.

H. G.

A shocking business Sunday night. A party of—(I know not what name to give the stupidity or barbarity)—rose up in two of the streets of Dublin, murdered a judge, killed his nephew, in the presence of his daughter, shot a colonel, and wounded a passenger—fled and were taken. This is getting up merely to be cut down—their hanging is of little moment—but they ruin the country. I have not

heard anything further, nor can I find out what instigators these wretches could have had.

Rev. Dr. Berwick, Castle Forbes, Longford.

Abortive insurrections have ever been the bane of Ireland, and have served only to confirm the power whose overthrow they contemplated: they gave vigour to the Anti-Catholic and Orange party, and secured their continued triumph over the people: the proceeding of 1803 was miserable in its attempt, but fortunately limited in its extent, and confined to very few, and those of the lowest order. Robert Emmett was the third son of Dr. Emmett: he had imbibed the political feelings of his brother, but wanted many of the qualities he possessed: devoid of caution, foresight, and prudence; ardent, spirited, and impetuous. His mind was cultivated, and his powers of eloquence were surprising, but his oratory was figurative and luxuriant,—too ornamental to be argumentative, too flowery to be persuasive, yet he pleased the ear and fascinated the auditors by the fluency and richness of his language. He had no judgment, no discretion. He was an enthusiast—he was a visionary. Without a treasury, without officers, without troops, he declared war against England and France and prepared to oppose both. The one, if she sought to retain possession of Ireland, and the other, if she attempted to invade it. With a few followers he rose to take the Castle of Dublin and defeat a disciplined garrison. He put on a green coat and cocked hat, and fancied himself already a conqueror. If no lives had been lost he probably would not have suffered, although Lord Norbury was the judge who tried him: it was a schoolboy attempt, and did not merit the punishment he was doomed to suffer. He was often interrupted at the trial by Lord Norbury, but he pre-

served his temper and self-possession. He repeatedly essayed to speak, but was stopt by the Judge—he then exclaimed:

My Lords, since you control me, I submit, but it must be remembered I have not spoken in my defence. Posterity will recollect that my vindication has not been heard, and as there is now no man bold enough to write my epitaph, so there will be no man base enough to calumniate my memory.

When asked the usual question why sentence should not be passed on him: he exclaimed—

Sentence of death may be pronounced—I have nothing to say; but sentence of infamy shall not be pronounced—I have everything to say.

He was as cool and collected before his death as if nothing was to happen.* Peter Burrowes saw him on his way, and related a circumstance that occurred as he was going to execution. He had a paper that he wished to be brought to Miss Curran, to whom he was strongly attached; he watched his opportunity, and in passing one of the streets he caught a friendly eye in the crowd, and, making a sign to the person, got him near, and then he dropped a paper; this was observed by others, and the person who took it up was stopt; the paper was taken from him and brought to the Castle. Mr. Burrowes and Charles Bushe saw it and said it was a very affecting and interesting letter.†

* See his last letter to Mr. Curran about his daughter just previous to his execution.—*Life of Curran by his Son*, vol. ii. p. 160.

† In "Geoffrey Crayon," (a series of stories by Washington Irvine), will be found one entitled the "*Broken Heart*," which tells in a very interesting and touching manner, the history of their mutual affection; the colouring is rather extreme, yet it would have been perfect if the subsequent marriage of the lady had not destroyed the romance. The prettiest composition is Mr. Moore's melody "*Oh, breathe not his name, let it rest in the shade*," that was written on Emmett; but here too the poetry of the Irish bard, like the prose of the American novelist, is rather exaggerated.

An event occurred at this time which occasioned some annoyance to Mr. Grattan, whose affection for his early friend Hussy Burgh, and whose generous dispositions involved his friend M'Can and himself in apparent difficulty with Government. It has been already mentioned that an annuity had been granted to Dowdall, (Hussy Burgh's son,) who had lost his situation in consequence of his having furnished Mr. Grattan with some official papers relating to parliamentary business. The dismissal of this individual was unworthy of such a person as Mr. Foster, and probably he would have been restored if Mr. Grattan had applied to him, but that course he would never adopt, and he directed his agent, Mr. M'Can, to remit the money to Dowdall, who had been arrested when the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; no charge or accusation was brought against him; no crime or offence was proved against him. When he was sent to Fort St. George, Mr. Grattan considered it would be ill done on his part if he discontinued the stipend merely on that account, and it was transmitted to him through his agent. The prisoners who were confined there had signed an agreement to banish themselves abroad, and not to return to Ireland. Dowdall, with becoming spirit, declined to affix his name to the paper, he rejected the proposal, and asserted his innocence, asked for trial, claiming a right of return to his country; at length he was liberated, and came back to Ireland greatly impoverished and exasperated to the greatest degree at the treatment he had received. His education had been good, his person was handsome, and his manners were insinuating; but he fell into bad habits and bad company, and Mr. Grattan being informed of this desired M'Can to discontinue the allowance.

About this time some circumstances occurred which induced a friend of M'Can to apprise him that events were likely to happen that would seriously affect the Government. He communicated this to two of his brother acquaintances in the revenue, Mr. Annesley and Mr. Croker, and stated his ignorance of what it was, but recommended them to put Government on their guard. They thought, or affected to think, little of the matter, and neglected to do so. However, when the events of the 23rd July took place, a peace-officer and a party of military entered M'Can's house and arrested him. They seized his papers and letters, opened his escrutoire, took 500*l.*, the greater part of which they never restored, and conveyed M'Can to prison. Dowdall's receipts for the annuity were found, and M'Can was brought before the Privy Council. He sought for his acquaintances Mr. Annesley and Croker to befriend him, but conscious in all probability of their error in disregarding his suggestion, *they absconded from the city and left M'Can to his fate.* Among those who sat at the Privy Council were Lord Redesdale (chancellor), O'Grady (attorney-general), Messrs. Wickham and Marsden (secretaries). The proceedings were singular, and often repeated by M'Can in presence of persons who would have corrected him if his statements were exaggerated, but who, notwithstanding, as I well recollect, confirmed his narrative. Those who have known the late Chief Baron O'Grady (Lord Guillamore), will easily recognise his peculiar style and manner from the following interrogatories:—"*Come, Mr. M'Can, tell us the fact, we know all about it*"—(they only knew of the receipts from Dowdall); "*you may as well speak out; you need not be afraid; we shall take care of you; we shall get you a place*

out of the country, and send you there safely; and we will give you 10,000*l. Come, now, tell us the truth about Mr. Grattan!!*" "Sir," said M'Can, "I tell you if the King had as good and loyal subjects in Ireland as Mr. Grattan, things would not be as they are; there is not a more honest or loyal man in his Majesty's dominions." "*Aye,*" said O'Grady, "*take care, Mr. M'Can, take care what you say.*" "*I hope so,*" said Lord Redesdale, in a marked tone of voice. M'Can could only state the transaction, and there was nothing to be condemned in it. This Star Chamber mode of proceeding was rather an improvement since 1798, yet, in plain English, what did it amount to? A person's agent is arrested and his papers seized, and money is offered to him, not as a bribe to speak false, but as an *inducement;* that is, an offer of protection if he speaks true, and money if he speaks more, and this *from one judge in presence of another.* It was nothing else than a system of terror and of torture to catch false confessions—by money in the one case as by whips in the other!*

* The old leaven of malice still existed and manifested itself in the following remarkable instance.

Parliament had been dissolved on the 29th of June, 1802, and in the city of Dublin Mr. Grattan and Mr. George Ponsonby proposed and seconded Sir Jonah Barrington as candidate to represent her, in consideration of the part he had taken at the Union: this afforded a display of that bitter and unmanly animosity that in this case only expired with its possessor.

When Mr. Grattan presented himself to vote for Sir Jonah Barrington, Mr. Giffard objected to his competency, as having been disfranchised by the Corporation of Dublin in 1798. The rival candidates disclaimed any wish to avail themselves of such an illiberal advantage. Mr. Grattan's competency was, however, established, inasmuch as the act of disfranchisement was not recorded in the original hall, and his name still stood on the records of the town clerk's office. Before Mr. Grattan voted, he thus forcibly expressed his feelings on Mr. Giffard's objection; to which no reply was attempted by the objector, or any of his Orange associates. "The objection comes from the hired traducer of his country, the excommunicated of his fellow-citizens, the unpunished ruffian, the bigoted agitator, the regal rebel. In the city a

Mr. Grattan had written to Mr. Wickham to tell him that the money sent to Dowdall was by his orders, that all had been done by his directions, and that he would justify it. His letter, which was found among M'Can's papers, in which he stated the annuity would be stopped unless Dowdall returned to good and orderly habits, satisfied in a great measure the members of the judicial divan, but another document was likewise discovered which finally decided the matter, though it was by no means expected by some of these inquisitors, that was, a paper in Mr. Grattan's handwriting which contained the characters of the men who composed the United Irish Directory. It was a short work, describing the objects and conduct of that party. Among them were the characters of Emmett, Tone, Neilson, O'Connor, Jackson, and the Sheares. It was written by Mr. Grattan in his nervous and graphic style with great force and ability. It deprecated their proceedings as strongly as those of Government, and pointed out how fatal their designs would prove to themselves as well as to their country; it was severe, and drawn with that vivid mode of expression which is to be found in his reply to Lord Clare's speech that he published in 1800. These were probably written at that period, as they partook of the style and character, and no doubt were drawn as the reverse of the picture of 1782, and the celebrated men whose living portraits he then sketched off in such brilliant and genuine colours.*

firebrand, in the courts a liar, in the streets a bully, and in the field a coward."

Giffard published afterwards a pretended reply in a London newspaper, which was never uttered; but this practice of publishing falsehoods in England respecting Ireland and the Irish, did not rest here, nor is it confined to this single case.

* Mr. Grattan sincerely believed in the impolicy of the separation

But his generous and feeling disposition induced him to omit them, and they were left out of the work and remained in M'Can's possession. He was little aware that this neglected and forgotten treasure would prove far better than the 10,000*l.* which the Attorney-General offered him. The document being examined, was read, and it may well be supposed that the Privy Council were astonished;—they looked aghast. The Chancellor was surprised, O'Grady looked amazed, Wickham appeared somewhat less grave, Marsden muttered his astonishment, but M'Can beamed radiant with joy,—his words were verified, his friend was exculpated, his own liberty secured. The Council broke up; the tables were turned. Their satisfaction, though silent, was no doubt complete. Poor M'Can was immediately liberated.*

This interesting and valuable document, on which mankind would have had a claim as well as M'Can, met with an unexpected fate. Mr. Grattan, as appears in his letter, desired it should be destroyed. M'Can was not willing to do so, and preserved it, notwithstanding this injunction. He looked upon it as a sacred relic, on which his liberty had depended, and to which perhaps he may have owed his life. However, Mr. Grattan shortly after this occurrence went to M'Can, and insisted on the document being destroyed, and stood by till every page was committed to the flames and consumed, observing "it shall never

party, and had little personal acquaintance with them, and many of their enemies were about him, which accounts for the opinions he entertained of these individuals.

* He was, however, deprived of his fees and salary for three months, when he was restored to his situation in the revenue, but his 500*l.* was not restored to the escrutoire, however they very politely returned him the paper that saved him.

be said that I have spoken ill of the dead." Pending these transactions Dowdall fled to France, and was heard of no more; some persons asserted that he had entered the service of that country, and was killed in the expedition to Flushing in 1809.

The following letters explain the subject.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. WICKHAM.

SIR,—I was informed yesterday of some of the particulars of Mr. M'Can's examination.

I have the honour to inform you that he acted regarding Mr. Dowdall by my particular orders, and that I am ready to defend my conduct on that head whenever called on. I have the honour to be, sir, your very obedient humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. FORBES.*

August 11th, 1803.

MY DEAR SIR,—Write to me by to-night's post. I have no apprehensions about our friend, as I know his perfect innocence; but I am vexed that even a suspicion should take place. Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO ROSS M'CAN.

Tinnehinch, August, 1803.

DEAR M'CAN,—I send for the trunk. Send me the Hibernian. You and Mrs. Rish† ought to make affidavit to the contents of the first letter, as set forth in the narrative, unless the letter be found. Also she should make affidavit that the last was given on the express condition that D—— should leave the kingdom and never return. Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

It were much to be wished that the letter were found; it is a great loss.

* A relation of John Forbes, (Mr. Grattan's great friend,) and a connexion of Mr. M'Can's.

† The person who had the receipts.

Burn the manuscript which contains the characters; it is severe. The persons are dead or miserable. It would appear flattery to the Government, and cruelty to the deceased.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

Tinnehinch, 18th August, 1803.

DEAR M'CAN,—On recollection, *No.* I will have no affidavit; it would show an anxiety about nothing. The transaction is an honest one, and so it appears without further proof. I should only wish you to look for the letters. Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

The following were the letters alluded to.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

March 6th, 1802.

DEAR M'CAN,—I wished to have seen Dowdall to-day, to repeat my advice to him to keep himself out of all plots or confederacy. If he does not, he may be certain he will be discovered, and will be ruined. Also I wished to tell him that I cannot think of recommending him as a clerk to any merchant without the fullest assurance that he holds no intercourse or communication with any plan or meeting of the above description. Until I am satisfied that he keeps clear of all such, I find it improper, and therefore impossible, to afford any pecuniary assistance. Yours truly,

H. GRATTAN.

We certify that the above is a true copy of the original letter—
T. M'CAN.
A. FORBES.

MR. DOWDALL TO MR. GRATTAN.

SIR,—I have seen a letter from you to Mr. M'Can, wherein you are kind enough to express an apprehension that I may again bring myself into difficulties by political connexions, I beg leave in the most solemn manner to assure you that I have not, nor is it my intention to form any such connexion; and that I have as much as possible avoided, since my return to Ireland, conversation on that subject with those who, from the character persecution had given me, would have confided to me their sentiments.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your devoted and obliged servant,

WILLIAM DOWDALL.

To Henry Grattan, Esq., 27th March, 1802.

We certify that the above is a true copy
of the original letter—
T. M'CAN.
A. FORBES.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

April 1802.

DEAR M'CAN,—I gave Dowdall my answer already, and did it with great concern: but he has himself rendered his request impossible. Can I recommend to any merchant's house a person who wishes to be a political agent? I can only repeat the advice which I formerly gave to no purpose, to keep out of all plots and politics. Yours truly,

HENRY GRATTAN.

We certify that the above is a true copy
of the original letter—
T. M'CAN.
A. FORBES.

The British Minister had engaged Mr. Plowden to write on the subject of the Union, and expected to find in him an able defender of his measures; but when Mr. Plowden came to Ireland, and ascertained the real state of affairs, justice in his mind prevailed, and, to his honour be it said, he wrote as he felt, not as Mr. Pitt and Mr. Addington wished. The latter was surprised and displeased, and Mr. Plowden was in consequence discountenanced by the court, but commended by the people. The letter of Mr. Plowden will disclose the bond that united the Addington administration, it shows the conduct and feelings of the King, and his determined opposition to the Catholic question. The letters of Lord Fitzwilliam speak the goodness of his heart, and the kind feeling that on all occasions and under all circumstances he manifested towards Mr. Grattan; that

to Mr. Plowden is true throughout, and is singularly applicable to the present time, when among the most elevated of the British senators a man has been found to make the revolutionary assertion that the Irish were "aliens in blood, aliens in language, aliens in religion." Fortunate for themselves if they had been unanimously alien in politics. Mr. Addington's sentiments were worthy of his administration. Mr. Plowden's history shows his labour and his independence of mind, when he had spirit to write with freedom and without fear, regardless of a Government that would patronize him, and only mindful of the injuries of the people whom he described.

LORD FITZWILLIAM TO MR. GRATTAN.

Wentworth, Sept. 23rd, 1803.

I was ignorant how little distant I was from a person I so much esteem, when Mr. Caldwell put your letter into my hands, but I felt the most sincere gratification, when I found myself in possession of your engagement to make me a visit. We shall remain in Yorkshire till November, and shall be always at home, except next week, when we go to Doncaster races. Lady Fitzwilliam depends upon the pleasure of seeing Mrs. Grattan, and, indeed, I must lay in a claim to that of seeing the whole family, the young ladies and the young gentlemen, to make whose acquaintance will be a great advantage and pleasure to Milton. God be praised, he is getting well again—he has had a bad illness, but it is over—nothing remains but a little langour and feebleness.—Believe me, with the utmost sincerity, most truly, yours.

WENTWORTH FITZWILIAM.

LORD FITZWILLIAM TO MR. PLOWDEN.

Wentworth, Sept. 26th, 1803.

SIR,—The very same sentiments, which directed me to decline the perusal of the manuscript, dictated me to decline giving my opinion upon the publication. I mean as far as it has relation to my administration in Ireland, upon that subject I cannot make a single remark.

But whilst I decline making any remark upon that part of the work, I feel the greatest obligation to an author, who has dared to meet universal prejudice, by tearing away the veil of fictitious story, and exposing facts such as they were.

This work has brought before the public this truth, little known and little thought of, that the Irish nation has consisted of two distinct and separate people:* the English and the Native Irish, the conqueror and the conquered: and that this distinction and separation has been systematically and industriously kept up, not by the animosity of the conquered, but by the policy of the conqueror. An exposition of such a system, let us hope, will render it too odious to be persevered in: it will force even its abettors, and those interested in its continuation to abandon it. I know not whether those who first proposed to you, to give to the public a small portion of Irish History, may be pleased with what has been the consequence of that proposal or not; but every man who feels an interest in the unity of the British and Irish people, will feel more obligation to him whose literary labours produce in the public mind, principles of harmony, conciliation, and good fellowship, than to all the most skilful artists in coercive restrictions.—I have the honour to be, with much esteem, Sir, your most obedient servant,

WENTWORTH FITZWILLIAM.

FRANCIS PLOWDEN TO MR. GRATTAN.

London, Essex Street, 8th Oct. 1803.

SIR,—The veneration I have for your character and judgment has hitherto deterred me from daring to present you a copy of my *Historical Review of the State of Ireland*, lest some things in it should meet your censure. I am now, however, emboldened to take that liberty, shielding myself under the approbation of your friend Lord Fitzwilliam (a copy of whose letter I enclose) against your judgment upon the failings, deficiencies, and errors of an author who is a stranger to your land, who has been imperfectly furnished with materials, much straitened in

* A most forcible though happily an exaggerated picture of this division of Ireland will be found in "*Ireland and its Rulers*," a recent work, wherein one regrets to find so much bitterness and injustice joined to manly principles, strong national feeling, honourable scorn of whatever is base, and an eminently graphic style.

time, and commanding no requisite but good will, to render historical justice to your country.

I beg leave to add to you in confidence, that having received Lord Fitzwilliam's letter on the day I had an appointment with Mr. Addington, to speak to him upon the subject of my history, I learned, unequivocally, from him, that it gave him both displeasure and offence; that as I wrote it under his sanction and countenance, *I ought to have rendered it pliant to what I must have known to be his principle and inclination towards Ireland.* I replied that I had pledged my word to write a true, impartial, and authentic History of Ireland, which, I conceived, would tend to harmonise that country and secure its affections to Great Britain, and that I humbly conceived that I had faithfully acquitted myself of my undertaking, and I showed him Lord Fitzwilliam's letter as a proof that in the eyes of some I had accomplished the object I had in view. He assured me *that the commendation of that nobleman* (however respectable his private character might be) *was my strongest condemnation* in his eyes—who had always been at issue with his Lordship on the affairs of Ireland. *That his determined opposition to the question of Catholic Emancipation, was the tenure by which he had acquired and retained his situation! by that he stood in that house!* and that his mind was made up to it upon reason and conscience. He had not read a line of my work, but was informed that I had spoken too freely, and to the prejudice of those to whom they looked up (the Orangemen) for the salvation of the country, and, particularly, of the late Castle junto—Lord Clare, the Beresfords, and Mr. Foster. He thought himself entitled to assume merit for suppressing his feelings upon the occasion. I have sent the books to Dublin by a private hand: I have a lively and grateful recollection of having spent one of the pleasantest days of my life at your house in 1793.

I have the honour to be, with the highest esteem and respect, Sir, your devoted and obedient humble servant,

FRANCIS PLOWDEN.

In May, 1797, Mr. Fox had seceded from Parliament, and only returned in December for the debate on the assessed taxes. From that period he took no part in public affairs, with the excep-

tion of the discussion on the 3d February, 1800, when his Majesty sent a message to Parliament respecting the overtures of peace from Buonaparte's consular government. He returned, however, on Mr. Pitt's retiring from office, on the 14th of March, 1801, and warmly supported Mr. Grey's motion on the state of the nation. It is to be regretted, that on the two most important subjects, and the greatest calamities that could befall any country—the Irish Insurrection and the Irish Union—such a man as Mr. Fox should have absented himself from Parliament. Mr. Sheridan was an Irishman, and his exertions in the House of Commons were always subject to that disadvantage; his efforts were, however, noble and laudable; and his repeated objections and divisions on the question of the Union, in opposition to the overwhelming majorities by which he was defeated, reflect on his patriotism and his talent the greatest praise. Mr. Fox's presence could not have turned the balance in favour of Ireland; but it was natural for her to expect that as he had assisted her in her efforts for independence in 1782, he would have come forward to oppose the violation of that treaty which, on the part of Great Britain, he had negotiated.

He was now desirous of forwarding the cause of the Catholics with more sincerity than Mr. Pitt displayed, but not with much power to assist them. The two great parties in the State were naturally desirous to strengthen their forces, and looked to the Irish recruits with which the British Parliament had been augmented. Whose they were to be, was now the point; and Ireland and all her questions became the battle ground for a general canvass and conflict—religious as well as political. Mr. Fox acted with great sincerity, Mr. Pitt with very little; the King with

determined hostility, the Prince (his son) with the semblance of support, for all within was false and hollow.

Mr. Fox conceiving it expedient to bring the question before Parliament, wrote to Mr. Grattan; and from the reply it would seem that he wished it to be brought forward under his auspices, or those of Mr. Ponsonby. Mr. Grattan declined, and his letter will be found interesting, in consequence of his observations on the state and Government of Ireland. It is worthy of remark, that many passages apply even at this day. So difficult it is to acquire political knowledge, and practise wholesome rules of government—ministers and nations seldom learn from experience; they are only roused to a sense of duty and of justice by some overwhelming national calamity.

The allusion in one of these letters to "*his men,*" refers to a corps of Yeomanry. It may be recollected that Mr. Grattan had, in 1798, retired from the corps of Cavalry in the county of Wicklow commanded by Lords Moncks and Powerscourt: the violence and excesses committed in those times under the sanction, if not with the approbation of Government, was the cause. Lord Hardwicke (Lord Lieutenant) was a milder character, and adopted a different course; and after the disturbance in 1803, Mr. Grattan offered to raise a corps on his estates in the Queen's county. This was at first refused, but subsequently Government thought proper to signify their assent, and granted him a commission of Captain to raise fifty men. This was speedily done; and for the first time in that part of the country the Catholics were admitted into the Yeomanry. The neighbouring corps was of an exclusive character, and composed of Protestants, many of them Orange-

men, who on festival days were accustomed to march with orange lilies in their caps, their bands playing party tunes. Mr. Grattan strove to alter this; he admitted Roman Catholics, got sergeants from the line to discipline the men, the expense of which cost upwards of 500*l.*; he discountenanced everything like party spirit. The corps, however, got the name of *the Virgin Mary Corps*, but in the end mildness succeeded, the parties were brought together; the most violent Orangemen associated with them, paraded and dined together; and afterwards, when the Vicarstown, which he commanded, was united with the Stradbally corps, the junction was effected in perfect amity. The orange lilies and party tunes were abandoned, the Protestants marched from parade to church, and the Catholics to chapel, and the mighty problem to reconcile two factions, which puzzled some statesmen, and could not be solved by others,* was effected by a country-gentleman with good sense, good temper, and good manners, but in one respect differing from the minister—that he had no interest in upholding division.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. FOX.

MY DEAR SIR,—I received your letter of the 27th. I shall speak to some of my friends in the city of Dublin. I entirely agree with you, that the Protestants ought to make a declaration to the purpose you mention. I shall recommend it to them strongly; they made such a declaration in '95. How far they will adopt my recommendation, I know not; they are *cold* and *timid*, and yet if they considered how necessary for what remains of their liberty it has become, to unite all the members of the empire against a foreign power, I think they should be active.

I wish you success, or if that at present is hopeless, that

* The author heard the present minister, Sir Robert Peel, declare i the House of Commons, the impossibility of reconciling such parties.

you may show to the Irish that they have able friends in England, and that the Catholics will find no connexion so beneficial. I think the debate so managed will do service. I lament that I cannot take part in it; it is one of the few questions that makes me regret I am not in Parliament. I thank you much for your anxiety about my health; I find myself recovering, and my friends dying about me.* I am glad to find that you enjoy health; however, it is on the same terms I mention, that we have the same losses to lament. My best regards to Mrs. Fox, and my most sincere affection to you. Believe me, my dear Sir, yours truly,

H. GRATTAN.

Bray, Dec. 4th, 1803.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. FOX.

Stradbally, Dec. 9th, 1803.

MY DEAR SIR,—This moment I received your letter of the 28th, it was sent to me to Stradbally, where I had been some time attending my men. I shall in a few days write my opinion regarding the subject of your letter. I wish to write at large, and so request a few days, and in the interim a few words to say.

I thank you for your anxiety about my health, which I find wonderfully re-established, and I have, I think, quite got the better of the complaint in my head. Ponsonby is at a considerable distance, otherwise I should call on him to discourse with regard to the questions your letter proposes. At the same time with excellent understanding and great powers (this as confidential) Ponsonby is lazy, and might not like to recommend a measure† which buckled care upon his back. He would have much to prepare and much to encounter. He would have a fine opportunity of asserting himself and his principles in the great family of the empire; I think he is equal to it, but he loves his ease, his bed, and is tired of the parliamentary battle.

You will please to remember me to Mrs. Fox in the strongest terms of regard, and believe, with greatest sincerity, yours ever,

HENRY GRATTAN.

* Mr. Latouche. † The Roman Catholic question.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. Fox.

Stradbally, Dec. 12th, 1803.

My dear Sir,—Your idea is reducible to two questions—whether a better system be not necessary to Ireland's permanent allegiance? whether the rejection of that system would not hazard our present repose? I incline to the affirmative of both propositions. The rejection of such a system, together with the acquiescence of our Parliament *in torture*, free quarter, and conflagration, produced the union with England. A similar proceeding at this instant in the British Parliament, accompanied with a justification of such violence, might lead to a union with France. The best way, perhaps, of showing immediate spirit is to bring forward the bad qualities of the enemy, but to *keep* in the background those of the Government. The question might be so greatly supported and the liberal sentiments so prevalent as to avoid my objection, but in that case the question would be substantially carried, and of such an event, so devoutly to be wished, I am no judge, not knowing the disposition or tone of the House; but if the question be lost and debated as in the Irish Parliament, or as the Martial Law Bill was in the last English Parliament, the discussion would do mischief; on that debate (I think it was in that debate) you and a few others had to stand against the representatives of England and against the representatives of Ireland—the latter giving false evidence against their country (they had before given corrupt votes), and the former making laws on that false evidence.

As to the other question, namely, the change of system, I must entirely agree. *The Union is not carried. The Parliament is destroyed, and that bond of union removed, but equality of conditions, civil or political, not even commenced.* All the subjects you mention—Catholic Emancipation (for such I must call it), payment of the Catholic clergy, tithe, and perhaps some *little* improvement regarding our church; and, above all, a faithful and cordial execution by the executive magistrate of the laws in favour of the Catholics; their appointment to a share in offices to which they are now qualified (I believe there are scarcely any of *them* so advanced); the withdrawing from any intrigue to exclude them from the corporations, to which they are admissible, but excluded by a faction; the

imposing silence on any Government press who would wish to sustain a religious war; the withdrawing the countenance of Government from all such who are notoriously and inveterately foes to the Catholic body; the gracious reception of their persons (it was so in the time of Lord Fitzwilliam). These things, the manners of the court, as well as their measures, would be absolutely necessary for that security and unity which you desire. *Legislative provisions are not enough; it is necessary that the Minister should love those provisions.* Mr. Pitt lost the benefit of the Catholic Bill, because, after he had given the law to the Catholics, he gave the execution of the law and the Catholics to their enemies.

That bill had hardly appeared when the leading Minister of Ireland pronounced it an act of *insanity*, and formed an intrigue with the ascendancy party to exclude the Catholic from getting corporate freedom, to which, by that bill, he was qualified. The Irish Government press accompanied laws of reconciliation by volumes of abuse against the parties to be reconciled.

Mr. Pitt had never been able to raise a rebellion by his measure if he had not been assisted by the gross manners of his partizans. Therefore what you say is extremely just. Legislative provisions alone wont do. The general spirit of the executive government must be looked to. It was against the hostility of that general spirit that the people, notwithstanding their legal acquisitions, revolted; a revolt very criminal, very senseless, but deriving its cause from the Government, which was guilty not only of its own crimes but the crimes of the people.

I am the more fully convinced that *the system caused the rebellion, and that allegiance—permanent, active allegiance —is only to be secured by its removal*, when I consider the good effects that have attended its abatement.

Without any alteration in the legal condition of this country, and merely by a temperate exercise of the existing laws, the present chief governor of Ireland has more advanced the strength of Government and its credit, than could have been well conceived. A rebellion broke out in the capital: in a few days, without the TORTURE, he discovered, I believe, 2,000 pikes; and in a very few weeks had more yeomen than Lord Camden in the whole of his government; and without a single act of violence put down, I think completely for the present,

the insurrection; or rather, he set up the laws, and made *them put down* rebellion; withdrawing the credit of Government at the same time from religious and political controversy. From the manner in which this last rebellion was put down, I incline to think that if Lord Hardwicke had been Viceroy, and Lord Redesdale Chancellor, in '98, the former rebellion had never existed; but how *far either have powers to effect that radical change, and to plant loyalty—permanent, unfeigned loyalty—in this country, I have great fears; rather, no hopes that I shall live to see that executive or legislative philanthropy that shall make the two countries act as one,* not merely from the dread of France or the apprehension of plunder from their own populace, but from the love of one another. Should such an event take place, I shall feel much joy, and you will feel much comfort in the consciousness of being the principal cause.

I request to be remembered to Mrs. Fox, and to my friend General Fitzpatrick, and am, yours most truly,

HENRY GRATTAN.

Charles James Fox, Esq.

MR. FOX TO MR. GRATTAN.

London, March 17th, 1804.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have not for a long time had so much pleasure from any political news as from Mr. Bowes Daly's information that there is some probability of your coming again into Parliament for Dublin. Believe me it is a time when by so doing there is a chance of your being as useful as at any former period of your life. Ireland is the most in danger of any part of the empire; and Ireland also is the country to which the application of liberal principles, and what I will call *our* system of policy, is most required, and may be most useful. It is better that the attempt should be made by us English, than that it should not be made at all; but it would be made with a far better chance of success, both with respect to numbers and public impression, by an Irishman; and of all Irishmen, by you.

In the present disgraceful state of our Government, too, where it seems to be the system that no one man of any party, who has displayed any ability or character, should be employed.

So far on public grounds; but let me add that I may be

somewhat biassed by my private wishes that your business and duty should lead you to a country where we can sometimes meet, and at least, if no good can be done for the future, talk over past times.

Mrs. Fox desires to be kindly remembered. I am very truly, my dear sir, yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

I go out of town in a few days. If you write, let it be to St. Ann's Hill.

To Henry Grattan, Esq., Dublin.

The following letter regards the publication of the memoirs of Lord Charlemont, by Mr. Hardy, who, after the struggles on behalf of Ireland, had retired to the county of Wicklow, and settled in the neighbourhood of Tinnehinch, close by Mr. Grattan. Attendance on Parliament had impaired a fortune that never was considerable, and with his wife an invalid, and a young family, he was left without any assistance or consolation whatever, except that (which to an honest mind is the greatest), the reflection that he had faithfully discharged his duty to his country, and, in the midst of his distress, had unhesitatingly refused from Government great and tempting offers, such as would have raised him at once to affluence—offers, too, that some of his friends solicited him to accept. He was by nature and habit inclined to indolence —his mind was feeble, though polished, and he wanted the vigour necessary for those who are fated to contend with adverse fortune. His taste and love of literature led him to become the friend and admirer of Lord Charlemont, and, on his death, the present lord assented to the publishing the account of the tour in the Greek islands which his father had written: but Hardy was dilatory, suffered the opportunity to pass by, and hence the work never appeared. He was now urged to write the memoirs of the late lord, and

Mr. Grattan and Mr. Berwick pressed him very anxiously, knowing in what esteem he held the name and virtues of Lord Charlemont. At length their suggestions prevailed, and Mr. Hardy published the memoirs in two volumes, in a manner that did honour to the taste and feelings of the writer, and to the distinguished character whose national services and private virtues he there commemorates.

The first of the following letters is a remarkable instance of the faults of style to which Mr. Grattan was liable.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

October 24th, 1804.

THURSDAY next, my dear doctor.

I should have gone to the Duke of Leinster's funeral, but did not know of it, till it was over. The poor duke—we could not spare him—he is a public and a private loss—there are not many now left—it is a subject too melancholy to dwell on—it is a most melancholy event—accompanied with other melancholy events, and all together making life what it was intended to be—of little moment—a strife in which every day a friend is knocked on the head by your side, preparing us for what we must expect. I wished the country had not been knocked on the head also—for in the course of things she might have lived longer.—Yours,

H. G.

Our regards to Mrs. Berwick and the children.

SAME TO SAME.

Stradbally, Nov. 23rd, 1803.

It is too late, my dear doctor, to go back, he* has declared that he will publish, by subscription, the life of Lord Charlemont—he must go on with it.

By relinquishing that plan he forfeits the chance of succeeding with the other—for on what foundation does the other plan stand, except on the dereliction of a public ser-

* Mr. Hardy.

vice, which Hardy's declarations, situation, &c., have rendered necessary to him—such a plan will produce nothing except a silent censure and a miserable pittance. His own debts even will not be paid by it—the debt of respect which the public owe to him will—what you mention regarding bills, is a proof that he has delayed the work, and has not a moment to lose, and it is a reason for collecting subscriptions for the work. Now, my advice to you is to apply immediately for subscriptions for the Life of Lord Charlemont, to be published in one volume, by Francis Hardy, Esq.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

CHAPTER VIII.

State of affairs on the continent of Europe in 1804 and 1805.—Conduct of Buonaparte.—His letter to the King.—Parties in Parliament.—Mr. Addington.—Mr. Pitt.—Letters of Lord Redesdale to Lord Fingall.—Mr. Grattan solicited to return to Parliament.—Mr. Fox's letters.—Mr. Pitt's conduct to the Catholics.—His message to Lord Hardwicke.—Proceedings of the Catholics.—Apply to Pitt.—Entrust their petition to Mr. Fox.—He moves on their petition.—Account of Mr. Grattan's speech in the Imperial Parliament.—Its success.—Pitt's remark.—Lord Byron's.—Letter to Mr. Grattan on the subject from Dr. O'Leary.—Lord Tyrawly.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Hardy and M'Can.—Breach between Pitt and Foster.—Mr. Grattan wishes to retire from Parliament.—Fox's letter.—Mr. Grattan to James Grattan on the study of history.—To Dr. Berwick.—Victory at Trafalgar.—To Mr. Plowden.—Irish history.—Death of Mr. Pitt.—Change of administration.

At the period when Mr. Fox applied to Mr. Grattan, in the following letter of March 1805, the affairs on the continent of Europe presented a very unfavourable appearance for the repose and security of England. The peace of Amiens concluded in October, 1801, had terminated in May, 1803. Buonaparte was First Consul, and had dissipated a conspiracy that he accused England of fomenting. In February, 1804, he had got rid of Georges and Pichegru by death, and of Moreau by banishment. In April he had seized Sir George Rumbold, the British *chargè d'affaires* in Lower Saxony, and put him into prison. In March he had arrested the Duke D'Enghein, and shot him at Vincennes. And finally, in May, he got himself elected Emperor of the French.

The pretexts for breaking the treaty of peace with Great Britain were various. The delay of abandoning Malta was advanced as the chief cause; the negotiations had been protracted—political excuses were pretended; but the real cause was the ambition of the French ruler, irritated, as he appeared to be, by the intrigues he imputed to England, and by the licentiousness of her Press, whose attacks he felt and complained of. At this time France had possession of a great portion of Europe; Buonaparte aimed at the entire; and as he found England his chief obstacle, he prepared every effort to overcome her. He got Spain at last to join in opposition to England; he got Genoa to undertake to supply him with 6,000 seamen; he formed a flotilla at Boulogne, and encamped 100,000 men on the heights in view of England, and exercised them incessantly in naval and military tactics. His influence extended, directly or indirectly, over Italy, Naples, Switzerland, Piedmont, and Spain was now added to the confederacy.

Still the most specious professions of peace were held out,—offers were personally made by the Emperor; and he commenced the year 1805 with an autograph letter to the King of England, professing deep anxiety for friendly terms and the restoration of peace. His letter was coldly received, answered not by the King, but by one of the Ministers. Buonaparte feeling himself repulsed, grew angry and meditated revenge; and this he fully but fatally enjoyed within the short space of one year, in the death of Nelson,* the victory at Austerlitz,† and the demise of Pitt.‡

* 21st October, 1805.

† 2nd December, 1805, Austrians and Prussians defeated by Napoleon, whose account states 30,000 prisoners, and twenty generals, and forty standards of the Russian Imperial Guard.

‡ 23rd January, 1806.

The state of parties in England at the beginning of 1805 was unsettled and singular. None of the various bodies that directed political measures were popular with the people of either country. Mr. Addington * had been tried, and had failed through incompetency. However he was re-admitted by Mr. Pitt soon after; but this did not add to the strength of that party; and although Mr. Pitt† introduced Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, yet he lost Lord Grenville (in himself a host). He had declared Mr. Addington incapable —he found him intolerant; yet he joined that incapacity and added to that intolerance, even after the letter from Lord Grenville condemning it.

* In 1805 he was made President of the Council; his private interviews and his influence with the King forced him back to power.

† On the 10th of May, 1804, Mr. Addington resigned the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Pitt was appointed to succeed him. The following was the list of the new administration:—

First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. William Pitt.
President of the Council, Duke of Portland.
Lord Chancellor, Lord Eldon.
Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Westmoreland.
First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Viscount Melville.
Master General of the Ordnance, Earl of Chatham.
Secretary of State for the Home Department, Lord Hawkesbury.
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Harrowby.
Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies, Earl Camden.
President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India, Lord Castlereagh.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Mulgrave.
Secretary at War, Right Hon. William Dundas.
Treasurer of the Navy, Right Hon. George Canning.
Joint Paymasters of His Majesty's Forces, Right Hon. George Rose, Right Hon. Charles Somerset.
Joint Postmasters General, Duke of Montrose, Lord Charles Spencer.
Secretaries of the Treasury, William Huskisson, Esq., William Sturges Bourne, Esq.
Master of the Rolls, Sir William Grant.
Attorney-General, Hon. Spencer Perceval.
Solicitor-General, Sir Thomas Manners Sutton.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Earl of Hardwicke.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Lord Redesdale.
Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir Evan Nepean.
Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland, Right Hon. Isaac Corry.

He introduced into Government a new and formidable principle, — namely, an engagement not to bring forward particular measures that might prove disagreeable to the King. This practice, so pregnant with danger, was wholly unknown to the Constitution, and was justly condemned by the succeeding Ministry in 1807; but it gained for him the King's party, which constituted his main strength in the House of Commons. By this he was bound to keep up the exclusive principle as regarded Ireland, which had formed the bond of Mr. Addington's Government, and to which Mr. Pitt now gave an additional proof of his adhesion by continuing Lord Redesdale as Chancellor in Ireland, after he had given such public and decisive proofs of his disqualification in the letters he addressed to Lord Fingall.

Mr. Fox's party was rather on the increase, and among his friends were persons of known liberal principles, and men of very considerable talents and of rising abilities; but they had not the King, neither had they the people; the Irish deprived them of the former and Buonaparte of the latter. The King would not listen to overtures from the Catholics, and the English would listen to nothing from France. Mr. Pitt's was the war party,—the hatred of Buonaparte and the activity of the Press upheld him; for he had gained little character by his conduct to the Irish, and little strength by discarding Mr. Addington at one period and reinstating him at another. The reflecting portion of the community were also beginning to think that the most likely way to conquer Buonaparte was to leave him to his ambition and his extravagant aggressions, which they knew were often likely to react on their author and bring him to destruction. Some coldness, too, was perceivable as to continental coalitions, that had already proved so fruit-

less and so expensive. But as the weakness of Mr. Addington's administration had vexed the people, so the preparations of the French now roused them, Mr. Pitt called upon all classes—the army of reserve—the militias—the volunteers; they were all brought forth into action. He paraded with them—he reviewed them—in person he inspected them—he roused their spirit—he marshalled their numbers; and amidst the cheers of England, pointing to the opposing camp at Boulogne and to the flotilla of France, he viewed them with scorn and set them at defiance.

As regarded Irish affairs, there was no Irish standard, and as yet no Irish question. The Union seemed to have kept the Irish mind in abeyance, and men waited to behold the working of the grand imperial measure which had promised so much and was to effect everything. The disturbances of 1803 had somewhat thrown back the Catholics; they were silent and apathetic—discontented, though not disaffected. At length they were roused* by the imprudence of Lord Redesdale, the Irish Chancellor, who, on granting in 1803 the commission of the peace to Lord Fingall, had addressed to him a letter expressing sentiments with regard to the Catholics most intolerant and offensive,—injurious to their character as loyal subjects, and insulting to their faith as Christians. This produced a spirited and able reply from Lord Fingall, and several letters were written on both sides: as regarded argument the contest was soon decided; for the calm and dignified tone used by Lord Fingall left little doubt on the mind of any unprejudiced per-

* Sir John Wrottesley, in his motion on the subject of Ireland, brought the affairs of that country, and the conduct of Government in 1803, under the consideration of the House.

son on which side lay the victory, as well as the right.*

In the English House the Irish had no party and no power. Mr. Ponsonby had entered Parliament, and his connexion with English families, in addition to his talents and his name, deservedly gave him considerable weight; but it was individual importance, not national. The high Irish Protestant party who were in the House were neither numerous nor able; and it did not seem to be Mr. Pitt's† desire to encourage them. Their ready and unhesitating support of the strong measures continued by the Imperial Parliament against Ireland (martial law and suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act), could not be very acceptable to any man who (like Mr. Pitt) professed a regard for free institutions, and who had promised very different results to follow from the Union. These men had little weight in Parliament, and had only a chance of being elevated by some violent outburst of religious bigotry; but neither Mr. Addington nor Lord Redesdale were daring enough to call into active operation their mischievous qualities, and therefore they remained inoperative till the time of Mr. Perceval and Mr. Peel.

At this juncture Mr. Fox considered it an important object to bring over such a person as Mr. Grattan, in whom, exclusive of the attachment he always had entertained for him, he beheld a leader around whom the Irish party were likely perhaps to rally, and under whom they would be more likely to act with unity and effect. Another step,

* They were commented on by Mr. Fox and Mr. Canning in Parliament with just severity, and contributed to the fall of the Addington administration; Mr. Perceval maintained there would have been no evil in writing the letters if they had not been published!

† Note his remarks on Lord Clare when speaking in the Lords about Ireland, *ante*, vol. iii. p. 403.

as he thought, would be gained if Mr. Grattan could be induced to assist in English affairs, as he knew him to be a man of bold resolve, but of prudence and caution, and firmly opposed to everything like French politics. The aid of the Irish auxiliaries had already been recognised by Mr. Pitt with a seeming, though affected, gratitude, when he congratulated the country on one of the benefits of the Union—namely, that the Irish members had occasioned the majority that carried the resolution in favour of the abolition of the slave trade.

But Mr. Grattan did not enter so far into the views of Mr. Fox; he thought it better that his exertions should be limited to services towards Ireland, and he was not so fondly wedded to the principle or name of a Union, as to embark heart and hand in the tempestuous sea or corrupt schemes of British politics. Besides this, the Irish members were but strangers in a new country, and not bold enough to set up a standard of their own. Many of them preferred to wait for their chance of a few crumbs from the great man's table; others felt that they were degraded by the act of Union—the iron had entered into their souls and fast bound them—gold had touched their palms and bribed them—they were lowered in their own esteem, and as yet did not feel or take courage to recover their proper level as the representatives of a nation.

Such being the state of things, Mr. Grattan was called upon by Lord Fitzwilliam and Mr. Fox, and at length was induced to enter the Imperial Parliament. Some of his friends said he never should have gone there; others that his efforts would prove unavailing, and that he would do the state no service; but he wished to benefit Ireland, to forward the Catholic cause, and, if possible, to

keep the two countries connected together; for he was always as strongly averse to separation as he was to Union. He thought that Ireland could not form a better connexion with any other nation, and if left to herself, so far as was consistent with the English connexion, and freed from corrupt influence, she could prosper much more speedily and advance with greater certainty, than if attached to any other country which would keep her in a state of garrison, afraid lest she should be retaken by England. Had the population been larger and more united, or the distance between the two islands greater, he might have seen another possible condition,—namely, absolute independence and separation; for he would not have been startled by the boldness of the idea. He always considered the power of France very formidable, but not dangerous, unless increased by the imprudence of the British Minister, and the consequent discontent of the Irish people. Impressed with sentiments such as these, he was persuaded to accept a seat in Parliament under the patronage of his former friend, Lord Fitzwilliam. At the commencement of his political life in both countries he was indebted to individuals for his return to Parliament,—in Ireland to the friendship of Lord Charlemont—in England to that of Lord Fitzwilliam; two of the best, the most virtuous, and noble-minded men that could be found in any kingdom.

MR. FOX TO MR. GRATTAN.

Arlington Street, London, Wednesday, March 13th, 1805.

DEAR SIR,—The business is now so far settled, that I can undertake that* the writ will be moved either on Friday or Monday next, and consequently that you will be

* Mr. Dundas vacated his seat to make way, at Lord Fitzwilliam's request, for Mr. Grattan.

elected in ten or twelve days from this date. You cannot imagine how much pleasure your consent to this arrangement has given me, and more especially since I learn this day, that the petition* will be put into my hands. *Pitt has peremptorily refused having anything to do with it,* and the delegates have in consequence determined to apply to Lord Grenville, Lord Fitzwilliam, and me. The advantage of this plan appears to me to be, that the next best thing to carrying the question, is to give reasonable hopes to the Irish that it will be carried, and so to deter them from desperate courses. Now this cannot be effected so well as by marking that all parties, except the King's and all considerable men (whether for property, talents, or rank) *except Pitt, are pledged to make it part of their system,* while even Pitt only objects to the time.

The course I take it will be this; the petition may be presented next week, or the week after, and a general notice given that a motion will be grounded on it soon after the holidays. This delay is not amiss for the purpose of giving solemnity to the business, and is partly necessary on account of those Irish members, who must attend the circuits in April. For many reasons the sooner you come the better, and especially if you could be time enough to be present at the presentation of the petition, and to say, even on that occasion, a word or two on its importance. If one knew of your coming, a short delay in the presentation could easily be contrived. Pray write by return of post.—Yours ever, sincerely,

C. J. Fox.

Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan.

London, March 16th, 1805.

My dear Sir,—I received yours yesterday, and lose no time in telling you, that you need not think of hurrying yourself. There is no chance of the Catholic business coming on in any *questionable* shape before Easter; and,

* The Roman Catholic petition praying for the repeal of the penal laws still in force against them. *Previous to the Union,* in 1799, Mr. Pitt had stated that their demands should be considered in the Imperial Parliament; *at the Union,* in 1800, he was said to have given a pledge to concede the claims; and *after the Union,* in 1801, he had under his own hand pledged himself not to take office unless they were granted, but from the above it appeared *he declared he would not have anything to do with them.* What opinion can posterity form of such conduct?

indeed, there seems to be a doubt whether, from the way in which the delegates understand their instructions, it may not be necessary for them to resort to their constituents for new instructions, or at least to their committee for explanations. As soon as anything is settled I will let you know. In the mean time the seat for you is, and will continue to be ready, when wanted. But I think it as well that the writ should not be moved till the Easter recess, at soonest, or rather till we know certainly that the Catholic business will come on in a short time.

From what you say, I conclude this plan will be most agreeable to your notions. The seat can always be vacated at a few hours' notice. The delegates are to come to Lord Grenville and me, in a formal manner on Monday, when, of course, the matter will be cleared up.—I am, my dear Sir, yours very truly,

C. J. Fox.

H. Grattan, Esq., near Bray, Ireland.

Mr. Fox to Mr. Grattan.

Arlington Street, London, Saturday, March 23rd, 1805.

My dear Sir,—I received yours yesterday. You will know from my letter of the beginning of the week, that there will be full time for any preparation you may wish. If I did not feel myself quite sure that your fame runs no risk, I would not have suggested the plan on any account whatever; for, exclusive of my personal regard, I consider the reputation of such men as you, as of infinite consequence to the public, *and to the general interests of liberty and virtue*, and consequently any circumstance that would tend to tarnish the splendour of such characters, or even to raise a doubt of their genius, would appear to me most disastrous.

You may depend on the condition (of your going out, if you *choose* it, when the business is over) being agreed to. —Yours ever.

C. J. Fox.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick.

Tinnehinch, 13th April, 1805.

My dear Doctor,—I should go to you certainly, but it is impossible. I must go to England to-morrow.

Mrs. Latouche will see nobody, otherwise I should have

gone to her. I have no hopes—the best of her sex, and most accomplished*—but she will not recover. I should have been inconsolable if anything had happened to Richard Marlay.† I do not believe I am yet returned to Parliament, but will be soon.—Yours, most truly,

H. G.

Dr. Berwick, Esker, Leixlip.

LORD FITZWILLIAM TO MR. GRATTAN.

Wentworth, April 27th, 1805.

DEAR GRATTAN,—Without receiving the sanction of your consent, the worthy electors of Malton, duly elected Henry Grattan, Esq., their representative, on Tuesday last. I hope their proceeding will be acceptable. The writ will of course be found returned to the proper office.—With sincerest regard and esteem, most truly yours,

WENTWORTH FITZWILLIAM.

The Catholics were now doomed to experience deep humiliation and bitter disappointment,—a just punishment for those among that body who had been weak enough to hearken to the false promises of the Minister, and to part with the liberties of their country. Mr. Pitt, finding himself embarrassed by the situation in which he stood as to the Catholics, and by the pledges he had given at the time of the Union, had directed Lord Hawkesbury (in January, 1805) to write to Lord Hardwicke that the discussion of the Catholic question would very much embarrass the Ministers, and would be determinately resisted by him. This letter was communicated to Lord Fingall, and laid before the Catholic committee. Several attempts had been made by the Lord-Lieutenant and his secretary (Sir Evan Nepean) to gain favour with the Catholics, in order to accomplish the

* She died very shortly after; she was a charming person, celebrated for her beauty, admired by all who knew her.

† Son of his uncle and early friend Colonel Thomas Marlay, who aided him in 1782, see vol. ii. *ante*.

wishes of Mr. Pitt, and deter them from making any application; and accordingly many persons appeared disposed not to urge their claims. Counsellor Bellew was averse to any petition being presented, and to this opinion Lord Fingall seemed to incline, till Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Scully declared they would forward *their* petition; upon which the committee (on the 6th of February) resolved that a deputation of five members—Lord Fingall, Sir F. (afterwards Lord) French, Sir E. Bellew, Denys Scully, and James Ryan—should be sent to Mr. Pitt to request that he would present the Catholic petition to Parliament, and they were to add that if he was restrained by *strong reasons* (meaning the King) from supporting it, that they would not then press for the adoption of the measure prayed for; that if he refused, they would apply to another person. On the 12th of March they had an interview with Mr. Pitt, who declined to present it, stating that he had strong and decisive objections against it. The interview lasted a considerable time. The deputies tried the Minister in various ways, reminding him of the Union,—of the hopes then held out, the advantage he would have if he monopolized the feelings of the Catholics and the presentation of their *request* (*for their right he took care to deny at once*). They almost supplicated him, and stooped to bring him round; but he was obdurate, and answered them *drily*—saying, he would feel it his duty to resist it. Their conduct was that of suppliants—they were not free—and as such they acted; but their conduct was sublime in comparison with that of the man they addressed; for who would have believed that at that moment Mr. Pitt had not only violated the pledge he had given in the memorandum drawn by Lord Castlereagh on his behalf, and given by Lord Cornwallis

to Dr. Troy, declaring he would not accept office except on the terms of Catholic privileges being granted, and upon which he had gone out of office in 1801,* but having returned in 1804, in direct violation of that compact, he went immeasurably further, for "*he voluntarily engaged never again to bring the subject under the consideration of his Majesty!!*" This extraordinary and unconstitutional proceeding of Mr. Pitt, in direct violation of his duty as Minister and oath as Privy Councillor, and of the positive engagement entered into along with Lord Cornwallis, was not publicly known, and only transpired through the imprudence of Lord Hawkesbury when he was (in 1807) debating the grounds on which Lords Grey and Grenville had retired from office.† He disclosed most unexpectedly this state secret, and published to the world the base and unconstitutional engagement. The Catholic deputation knew as little of Mr. Pitt in 1805 as the Catholic people did in 1800, or they might have been saved the trouble and humiliation of applying in so abject a manner to a man who had so grievously duped and deceived them; but it was not until after Mr. Pitt's death that the disgraceful compact which he had entered into with the King was discovered;—a compact so fatal to his fame as a statesman, derogatory to the dignity and duty of a Prime Minister, and so disreputable to him as a man of honour.

Disappointed as to Mr. Pitt, the Catholics applied to Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox, and to them they entrusted the presentation of their petition to the Imperial Parliament. It was presented by Mr.

* On the 8th of May, 1801, Lord Grenville wrote a very strong letter to Mr. Pitt, severely condemning the exclusive principle on which the new administration was formed. In 1804 Mr. Pitt made it more exclusive still.

† See Parliamentary Debates of 1807, on the question regarding the late administration.

Fox, and laid on the table on the 25th of March; and on the 13th of May he moved that it should be referred to the consideration of a committee of the whole House. It was ably supported by Mr. Fox; and opposed by Mr. Pitt, on the ground that the present was not the proper time. He did not say what would be the proper time; but from his statements it was to be inferred that it must be on a change in the King's sentiments or on his demise. Thus was Ireland insanely sacrificed to royal scruples or royal conscience. The debate lasted two days, and on a division the numbers were—for Mr. Fox's motion 124, and against it 336; majority against the Catholics, 212. In the House of Lords the petition was presented by Lord Grenville, and his motion for a committee was rejected by 178 to 49. Such were the first fruits of the Union, and such was the fulfilment of the pledges, without which, as Lord Suffolk said in the debate, Mr. Pitt would not have carried the Union.

As this was the trial of Mr. Grattan in the Imperial Parliament, much curiosity was awakened, and much anxiety was felt among his friends on the occasion. They had not forgotten the words that he had applied to Mr. Flood—"he was a tree of the forest, too old to be transplanted at 50." The fate that had attended Lord Clare, and the want of success on the part of Mr. Flood, added to the interest respecting this individual—the man who had for so long opposed the imperious conduct of Great Britain, denied her authority, defied her ministers and defeated their power,—he was now to appear before an assembly chosen by that nation whose pride in 1782 he had humbled, but who by fraud had triumphed in 1800 over his country. The question, too, which was the occasion of his entrance into Parliament, and one of

the greatest importance to the empire, was by no means popular in that assembly. The rights of the people of Ireland had never been received with cordiality or listened to with pleasure, though they were appeals to freedom; and the claims of the Roman Catholics had still to surmount great difficulties and great prejudices before they could effectually pierce the foggy atmosphere of St. Stephen's, and remove the cold insensible mass that weighed down the destinies of the country.

The Irish Church had sent forward their chosen champion, the representative of the Primate of all Ireland, as the opponent of Catholic emancipation; fortunately it was Dr. Duigenan. He came forward on this occasion to oppose the demands of the Catholics, yet notwithstanding the prejudices of the day, he made little impression. He tried his ponderous theology, but to no purpose; for he had "neither wit, nor words, nor worth, action or utterance, or the power of speech to stir men's blood." His appearance was forbidding, his manner was most ungracious, his tones most unpleasing. Altogether the exhibition threw an air of ridicule and burlesque upon the cause he was sent to support; his doctrines, though high-church, were not even palatable. The members, however, as happens too often in that assembly, honoured him with their vote, though they withheld their applause. The learned doctor failed most completely, and the cause of the Catholics triumphed by the discredit that fell upon its most violent opponent. After he sat down, Mr. Grattan rose to reply. His voice was strong, and free from the accent that impaired Burke's, though not sufficiently mellow. His figure was small and his gesture was peculiar, still it made an impression, because it followed

the impulse of a mind strongly impassioned and full of the subject.

The House paused for some time before they signified any opinion as to the individual upon trial; both parties looked to their several partizans,—the one to Mr. Fox, the other to Mr. Pitt. Each seemed to wait for the signal from their respective leader. Mr. Pitt sat all attention, his face resting upon his hand, and gave no symptom either of favour or of disapprobation. No emotion was visible on his part until Mr. Grattan, alluding to Dr. Duigenan, said—"his speech consists of four parts. First, an invective uttered against the religion of the Catholics; second, an invective uttered against the present generation; third, an invective uttered against the past; and fourth, an invective against the future. Here the limits of creation interposed and stopped the number. It is to defend these different generations and their religion that I rise —to rescue the Catholics from his attack and the Protestant from his defence." Upon this Mr. Pitt cried out "Hear! hear! hear!" This was the signal for his party—his followers caught the cry; those who paused before, no longer hesitated,—they cheered vociferously and were fully responded to by the opposition, and the entire assembly joined in loud applause. Mr. Grattan's success was established—the triumph was complete. Pitt turned to one of the members who sat by him, and said, "*Burke told me that Grattan was a great man for a popular assembly, and now I believe it.*" In short, the speech he delivered was attended with the most complete success,*—it pro-

* Lord Byron thus describes the scene in one of his letters:—"When the ministerial part of our senators had watched Pitt (their thermometer) for the cue, and saw him nod repeatedly, his stately nod of approbation, they took the hint from their huntsman and broke out into the most

duced great effect. The style was new, the manner was singular, the matter was so disposed as to please all. There was philosophy, sound political doctrine, polished satire, terse logic, brilliant oratory, and a spirit of nationality that was congenial to the heart of every freeman. Mr. Fox and the Whig party were highly gratified, Lord Fitzwilliam and his friends were in delight, and Mr. Grattan was complimented, visited, praised, and flattered by the leading men of both parties in England. Of the numerous complimentary letters the two following are selected.

DR. O'LEARY TO MR. GRATTAN.

May 25th, 1805.

'T is not in mortals to command success,
But we'll do better—we'll deserve it.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—I congratulate you, myself, and my country, on the honour your speech on the Catholic question has conferred on us. I have had many authentic accounts of the splendour of the performance, and the enthusiasm of its reception, and, indeed, I cannot express the satisfaction I felt at finding that it was not only equal to my expectation, but to my wishes. I have a little grandson, of about ten years old, who, after reading the debate, made the following silly observation. "Mr. Fox and Mr. Grattan were insuperable, they formed as it were a great mountain,—Mr. Fox, who was the *foundation*, had solidity and comprehension, Mr. Grattan was the *top*, whose sublimity touched the heavens." A few words now as to myself. I have long thought that age and refinement had extinguished every spark of pride, and suppressed every passion for praise, in my breast. But to find my name* inserted in the rolls of fame by such a hand as

rapturous cheers. Grattan's speech indeed deserved them—it was a "*chef d'œuvre.*" I did not hear *that* speech of his (being then at Harrow), but heard most of his others on the same question—also that of the war of 1815. I differed from his opinion on the latter question, but coincided in the general admiration of his eloquence. * * * * * I was much struck with the simplicity of Grattan's manners in private life—they were odd, but they were natural."

* He was alluded to in Mr. Grattan's speech.

yours, has, I must confess, awakened my sensibility, and reanimated my expiring pride. 'T is true offerings and sacrifices are made to *partiality*, perhaps, as often as to *piety*, and, though I know yours in the present instance have proceeded from the *former*, I thank you for them.—Believe me, with truth and affection, your sincere friend and *faithful confessor*,

FATHER O'LEARY.

LORD TYRAWLY TO MR. GRATTAN.

Moore Abbey, Monastereven, Ireland, May 24th, 1805.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—Your *début* in Parliament has struck your enemies dumb, and made your friends triumphant and happy, you have exceeded even my expectations. I hope the great Author of your being (to whom alone I pray) may grant you for a long while, good health, and the possession of those great talents with which he has endowed you, to support and protect your family, and to do honour to the land that boasts of having given you birth.

All the rational Roman Catholics think (and I agree with them) that you have ensured the ultimate success of their favourite measure, and seem indifferent as to the moment when it may be accomplished.

I advised you never to go into Parliament, unless called there by some great occasion, and you condescended to listen to me. I conjure you for your honour, and the advantage of the empire, never to quit Parliament as long as you can articulate.

Your situation in life is now much higher and greater than it ever was, or, indeed, could be in this country. You are received, admired by, and identified with a great, enlightened, and generous people—unlike the rabble of this country—that one day would draw you in your triumphal car to the Senate House, and the next, at the instance of such a mountebank as Dr. Duigenan, drag you in a cart to the place of execution. You and your family have the warmest affections of all under my roof.—My dear Grattan, yours, ever most truly,

TYRAWLY.

H. Grattan, Esq., Maddox Street, Hanover Square.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

9, Maddox Street, London, June 10th, 1805.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I got your letter, and am glad to hear so good an account of your health. You seem in good spirits, but in gloomy neighbourhood. Your two best neighbours, one is dead, the other distracted. The loss of Mrs. Latouche is irreparable. Mrs. Vesey has good sense to see it. The breaking up of Mrs. Latouche's house was, to me, the loss of private society in Dublin.

The Union, the loss of political life. The papers tell you everything that I can tell you, except that they do not give you anything of my speech, which, when it comes out, shall be sent to you.

I wrote a long letter to Hardy, containing what was more important than intelligence, namely, what I knew related to himself—he has no chance, but Lord Charlemont's Life and the publication of the History of Italian Poetry, that may support him till something happens, which is not very proximate. Lord Charlemont wrote to him, and told me I might write to him also, and assure him, that he might now publish that history, which he would get in his library. If he is afraid to go there, do you, and get the book, and use your influence with him not to delay. He has no excuse now, he has had for the life, time, materials, advice, necessity, and duty—duty to the cause and to himself, and yet, with all this, I believe it will be found difficult to make him do anything. I do not see any likelihood of a speedy change of ministry. I shall go home and dine with you and talk to Matthew,* if poor Matthew be forthcoming. I see Lord Perry very often, he is surprisingly, I cannot say well, but surprisingly free from the consequence of years—he enters into conversation, hears, answers, observes, and reasons better than any man of good sense twenty years younger. Our friend Tegart† I have seen, and have conferred with him upon medicinal topics—though I do not practice here—he asked about you. I shall see him to-morrow, and shall mention to him your present regimen.

London is become too expensive for a moderate fortune. The public entertainments to women, who are modest, and

* A favourite gardener, as fond of flowers as Mr. Grattan.

† A celebrated medical character, a great friend of the opposition party, and a fine Whig.

not of the very first fortunes, inaccessible—the pit is given up to women of the town, I speak of the opera, and the boxes purchased by women of great fortune: they go to two or more parties of the same night, and are on the flags great part of it, from the difficulty of getting their carriages, to which they are handed frequently by a police officer. I pay for horses exactly double what I paid ten years ago: port has become claret in price, and continues brandy in quality. Is the church in no danger? I will buy Fox's speech for you, which I lost or mislaid (his speech of 1803), he says it is his best.

Remember me to Mrs. Berwick.—Yours ever,

H. G.

Dr. Duigenan brought a library to the House of Commons, which he kept behind him, and turned back so often to the House to consult his books, as to exhibit a strange appearance.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. HARDY.

London, June 14th, 1805.

MY DEAR HARDY,—They steal my pens, so that I write worse even than usual. But I write this to repeat my wishes that you should, as soon as possible with any convenience, publish: Lord Charlemont did not get your letter for a long time, it was directed to his brother, and his brother was not in London: if you or Berwick (and do not delay) can find his travels, written and digested, as to be in a state for publication, I think he (the son) would agree to their publication by you—his object is answered by the credit, and he would be glad you should receive the profit. I think you would get money from a printer for the Life, and the History of Italian Poetry. The history will prove two large volumes: would you have me talk to a printer about it, I will try at all events: I think you may make a considerable profit—*but—but do not delay.* The minister on Wednesday was beaten,* but he will stand I think. The papers will inform you everything with respect to his Majesty: he is in good health, and in conversation not only rational but acute. I got your letter and thank you much. Parliament will be up probably soon after

* For the criminal prosecution of Lord Melville, for embezzling the public money and improperly applying 60,000*l.*, 238 to 229—majority against ministers, nine.

next Thursday, which day the state of the nation is to be debated. I do not believe there will be any parade days. The most rising young men in the Commons are Mr. Whitbread and Lord H. Petty: I think the former is now a very able member of Parliament, and will be a complete one. Fox is in perfect health and ability. I have dined much abroad and with pleasant parties—there is no excess except what one chooses to commit. Your *friend* Castlereagh does not stand high. Canning has considerable parts—but more parts than discretion—his conclusion on the 12th was well. The Attorney-General is a very good parliamentary speaker. Mr. Grant a most grave and severe logician, certainly very able, but not brilliant. Of Pitt I need not speak as you have heard him often.—Yours, most truly.

H. G.

The debate will come out they say to-morrow with the speeches revised,—I will send you one.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, June 19th, 1805.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I thank you for your letter. Poor Browne,* I believe with you, died of the Union; it proved the death of another, but compared with Browne, a very inferior man, Lord Clare; and I think it has extinguished Castlereagh, he is high in office, but in reputation lost. I had just read the article of his death in the paper and was lamenting him, he was to me an affectionate, faithful friend. I have had two occasions to feel concern for him, his political errors and his death. Bushe† and Moore are both very proper men. I will keep for you the debate on the Catholic question; it will be, I suppose, perfect as far as relates to some of the speeches.

I am happy at what you write about Kemmis,‡ I know he is a most particular friend of mine, to whom I have

* Dr. Arthur Browne, who first opposed, then supported, the Union, and who died broken-hearted. He wrote a pamphlet on the treaty of Limerick that was much noticed.

† Charles Bushe and Arthur Moore, both created judges.

‡ Crown Solicitor, a very clever individual, he managed the law business on the purchase of the Queen's county estates, under the vote of the House of Commons.

many personal obligations. I have a great opinion of his good understanding. I am happy at what you relate regarding the people of Ireland, *it is of the last consequence to their credit and fortunes, to keep clear of the senseless practice of insurrection, they have had sufferings enough to instruct them on that head.* The minister was defeated last Wednesday, but I think he will stand: at the same time he is very weak, and the opposition very strong. I shall go to Harrowgate in a week, and to Ireland in three. We are all well.—Yours truly,

H. G.

Ross M'Can, Esq.

The following letter requires explanation. In the debate on the Roman Catholic question Sir George Hill,* a connexion of the Beresford family, had spoken against Mr. Fox's motion, but had used nothing unseemly or personal towards Mr. Grattan or his friends. However, he chose to publish a speech, and inserted what he had never spoken, and made statements respecting him and his friends that were quite unfounded, and that conveyed gross imputation upon both. Mr. Grattan found it his duty to notice these, and he accordingly made an application to Sir George Hill, expressing his surprise at what he read, and which had not been spoken in the House. The dilemma in which Sir George was placed was somewhat awkward, as the gross impropriety of the proceeding—so unusual and so unparliamentary—was undeniable. Mr. Grattan was therefore obliged to press him upon the subject, and to insist on a total disclaimer, which was given; but some delay having occurred, he found himself obliged to have recourse to the extreme necessity which is always to be lamented, although sanctioned by usage and a sense of honour and

* This is the same personage who figures in connexion with the arrest of Wolfe Tone, when the French landed in the north-west of Ireland.—See Memoirs of Tone, vol. ii. p. 524.

duty. In the event of any untoward accident befalling him, Mr. Grattan thought proper to write to his son as follows:—

MR. GRATTAN TO JAMES GRATTAN.

MY DEAR JAMES,—In addition to the letter which I have written, I am to add, that you know so well my political principles as devoid on the one side of corrupt support of Government, on the other side rebellion—and above all others an Irish rebellion. You have read enough of Irish history to know the folly and ruin of that proceeding.

I would advise you to fix certain hours for application, so that one day with another, you may read some hours, or rather study a few hours. There are and must be times in which you will not be able to study at all: but they should not be long, and should be employed in learning the world—rise early—it is of the greatest consequence.

The course of studies you already know: but above all things attend to history, and ever make your own remarks as you read it—the Irish history, particularly from the accession of the House of Tudor—the English history, with a general knowledge of the history of Europe, the Roman, and the Greek—these are the histories you should know; the books in which those histories are contained I have mentioned to you. I believe I am to add to the catalogue Robertson's histories of Charles the Fifth and of America, and Carte's Life of the Duke of Ormond. Keep up the knowledge of the classics for ever. Demosthenes, Homer, Tacitus, and Horace, Juvenal, &c. Read the speeches of the great speakers in the parliamentary debates—learn the public accounts, viz. the produce of the yearly taxes, the expenditure of each year, together with the annual amount of imports and exports—take care of your mother, and be not only kind to her in dealings, but tender in your manner.

Her life may be long, but it depends on care, more on your care than on her own. Take care of your sisters and Henry—you must be their father now. As to a profession I would, if any, recommend the bar both to you and Henry. Your fortune will ultimately be large, but your income for a long time will be small. By all means continue in College

and take your Degree. I know you will always act like a man of integrity and a man of spirit.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

London, June 22nd, 1805.

Mr. Foster, on his appointment to the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, conceived that he had acquired greater financial powers than either the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (Lord Hardwicke) or Mr. Pitt were willing to allow. It was supposed that he had prepared some of his financial measures so as to give him a great share of patronage; this Lord Hardwicke and the First Commissioner of Revenue (Lord Donoughmore) would not agree to. Accordingly, a breach took place between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Foster, and it reached to such a height that Mr. Foster almost went into opposition, and on the 2nd of July took his seat on the opposite side of the house from that of the Government to which he belonged. Mr. Pitt, though displeased, did not like to break with Foster; he was much embarrassed, was declining in health, and was pressed by difficulties and desertions from within and without; so he compromised the matter. At first he contrived to postpone Mr. Foster's measures, on which Mr. Foster threatened to resign; but Mr. Pitt would not accept the resignation, so he compelled him to keep his place but abandon his bills. His speech in 1804 (in which year he was Chancellor of the Exchequer) was remarkable. He attributed the distress of Ireland to the Union. He stated that the debt in 1793 was only 2,400,000*l.*; in 1800 it had risen to 25,400,000*l.*; and in January, 1804, it amounted to 43,000,000*l.*; and in that year (1804) they had added to it no less a sum than 9,500,000*l.*; a quota far exceeding that settled at the Union. He calculated that, in 1800, the net produce of the

revenue was 2,800,000*l.*, at the time that Ireland owed 25,000,000*l.*; and in the last year (1803) it was only 2,789,000*l.*, when she owed 53,000,000*l.* Thus there appeared an enormous and growing increase of debt, a rapid falling off of the revenue, and a decay of commerce and of manufacture. So much for the boasted Union!

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

Harrowgate, 15th July, 1805.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—The Revenue Board will go on under its former master. Foster has ridden too hard, the same violent spirit that made him torture the rebels, has overturned himself; coupled with the fury of Lord Clare, can you be surprised that under such ministers there was a rebellion? When that violence acted against the people they kept their places, when it acted against men in power they lost them. Lord Clare quarrelled with every person in power, and turned himself out of the world; the other has quarrelled with many persons in power, and has turned himself out of office. Don't mention it, but he acted very imprudently, and his plans were jobs for himself, with some public advantage and more public expence and influence; he had nobody for him but Pitt, and Pitt gave him up for his convenience, as he did and must have done with regard to Lord Clare. I don't find any one appointed in his place; he may remain, but without his plans. I fancy the Custom-house is not very sorry.

They are in daily expectation of a victory over the French fleet, who have made a miserable figure. I think the minister will stand for some time even without a victory, the difficulty of a coalition is so great that I don't believe there will be one. The Opposition are very strong, and the Ministry very weak; Lord Melville has hurt their credit, and Lord Sidmouth their numbers. Parliament is prorogued by commission, and the King gone to Weymouth; he has abandoned his tour on account of his eyes, which are attacked by cataracts, for which it is said he is to undergo an operation.

Whatever is doing on the Continent proceeds very slowly, those powers are more inclined to negotiate than to fight, and if they don't agree to the latter England will

soon make peace. How goes on poor Ireland? Are the Protestants and Catholics still at war? Have they discovered that the spirit of loyalty is confined to the wine and not to be found in the wafer? No cup—no allegiance. That a good wine merchant should be of that opinion, I am not surprised; but that any other man should, amazes me. Bigotry is going down here—the activity of party could not excite a Protestant cry in this country. How is Wallace?* has he his place in the country? I am sure he is advancing in business. Ponsonby was greatly admired in England, and has secured the ear of the House of Commons—he is established there. The debate on the Catholic question is published—but observe some of the speeches never were spoken—particularly the attacks† on me, there was no attack whatever.—Yours most truly,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. FOX TO MR. GRATTAN.

St. Ann's Hill, 16th July, 1805.

MY DEAR SIR,—I ought perhaps sooner to have acquainted you, that the very day after you spoke to me, I saw Fitzwilliam, who confirmed what I mentioned to you, and said that, exclusive of the satisfaction it affords him to be the means of your sitting among us, it would be the greatest possible inconvenience to him, to have another vacancy at Malton at present. The manner in which Pitt has filled up the vacancies seems to me a decisive proof that he can have no serious thoughts of sincerely attempting a union of parties, but I am told his friends give out that no such inference is to be drawn, on the other hand it must be confessed that, if he was too weak before, he has not gained any accession, either of strength or reputation, by his new arrangements.

It is understood that he has made it up with Foster, who is to have his own way in every thing, whether Lord Hardwicke consent or not.

Mrs. Fox desires to be remembered to you, and joins with me in best regards to Mrs. G. and the whole family. She and I much regret that we had not the opportunity of seeing you and them here, and not the less so (for vanity will have her rights and dues) because we think this

* The Irish lawyer.

† By Sir George Hill, published not spoken, as before mentioned.

place looks, this year, in peculiar beauty.—I am, very truly, my dear Sir, yours ever,

C. J. Fox.

Henry Grattan, Esq., Harrowgate, Yorkshire.

The following letters contain some useful and interesting remarks on the study of history. This subject Mr. Grattan always recommended, not only by precept, but by practice; he was in the habit of abstracting and comparing the histories of divers nations—modern and ancient—with great care and attention: this course he pursued to the last. The Irish, English, Greek, and Roman histories were read and studied by him with the most persevering industry; and he regularly allotted a portion of each day for going over the remarks and observations he had made on this subject. Unfortunately, most of them have been lost; but what remains is of value.

MR. GRATTAN TO JAMES GRATTAN.

Harrowgate, July 14th, 1805.

MY DEAR JAMES,—Do not forget to read out loud every day some portion of Homer, and Milton, and Demosthenes, it would serve Henry to do the same. You will have time to read English, you know the books, I told you before. The great heads of the history of the present reign are the Middlesex election, the American war, the Irish revolution of '82, the French revolution and war. The great heads in the reigns preceding are, the civil war between the King and the Parliament, and the revolution. You should consult often what you have read and written on those subjects. Burke and Bolingbroke will give you style, and Junius,—the style of the latter would answer better for a public ear, because it is shorter, and was written for the public, not for the closet.—Ever yours,

H. G.

MR. GRATTAN TO JAMES GRATTAN.

Harrowgate, 28th July, 1805.

MY DEAR JAMES,—The reason why we began the English history with the reign of Charles the First, is,

that the events which preceded that reign, govern very little the events which followed; for instance, the disputes between the houses of York and Lancaster, and the claims of Mary to the crown of Elizabeth had exhausted their effects. But the religious, and still more the political animosities, which burst forth in Charles the First's reign, continue to effect the political world even to this day. They produced the civil war; they produced the cabal of Charles the Second; they produced the violence of the Whigs, near and before the close of his reign; they produced the still greater violence of James the Second, and, of course, the revolution, under whose consequences we live at this day. They did more, they caused a number of British dissenters to settle in America, who fled from the persecutions of Charles the First, to the free exercise of their civil and religious rights in another hemisphere, and there planted those principles, which afterwards resisted the violence of England, and established their independence in a century after. They did more, they caused the French revolution, because they communicated to the French, who came to assist the Americans, those impulses which the French afterwards indulged in to such fatal excess. From the beginning of that reign until the famous remonstrance you may pronounce Parliament in the right; for instance, in refusing a larger supply; in proceeding against the Duke of Buckingham; in forming the petition of right; in condemning arbitrary loans; arbitrary imprisonments; courts of high commission of star chamber; army without authority of Parliament; ship money; the judges who allowed it; and, finally, in proceeding against Lord Strafford (notwithstanding Hume on that subject). The principles on which they proceeded have been recognised as the rights of the subject, and a part of the fundamental law of the land; those principles compose principally the Declaration of Right, passed at the revolution, which is little more than the petition of right, rendered somewhat more minute and more comprehensive, and it is called a *Declaration* because it does not introduce a new law, but only declares what was before the law of the land, and the right of the subject. But there was another victory those principles obtained, without which their victory at the revolution had been in vain, namely, they proved afterwards an excellent practical system of government: had the people of England,

after the revolution, like the French, ran wild, they would, like the French, have put down the principles of their revolution, and the friends of James the Second would have said, that the doctrine of the Whigs, however fine in theory, was not fit for mankind. The English, therefore, owe their liberties to the moderation of their ancestors at and after the revolution, who avoided the example of their predecessors at the time of the famous remonstrance.—Ever yours.

H. G.

Mr. Grattan to James Grattan.

Harrowgate, 29th July, 1805.

My dear James,—I omitted to mention the grounds on which Hume defends the conduct of Charles I. First, he justifies the acts of the king, on the precedent of his predecessors, the house of Tudor, but he forgets that those precedents of the house of Tudor were violations of law, and his argument then is this, that the violations in one reign become in the succeeding reign laws; his second fundamental error is, that he denies the claims of the people to be free from taxes and arrests, except such as are warranted by parliament or legal trial, because under the reigns of the house of Tudor they were oppressed by both, but they were oppressed by both contrary to law. His argument then is, that infringement of right in one reign becomes in the succeeding a repeal of it; he makes innovations, laws; and he makes laws, innovations. But murder is not lawful more than oppression because it has not always been punished, neither does a man lose his right to his estate or his liberty because his ancestor has been robbed of both; rely on it, this principle will refute the greater part of Mr. Hume's defence of Charles I. The house of Tudor was arbitrary, and the reason was to be found in the weakness of the country, not the law of the land. The country had been exhausted by civil wars between the houses of York and Lancaster; further, the nobles had lost their strength by parting with their property, and the people had not grown into strength by acquisition, while the balance was trepidating, the king was absolute, and the laws were not so; but in Charles I.'s time, the people had become rich as the nobles had become poor. Lord Clarendon mentions that the property of the House of Commons in Charles I.'s time, greatly ex-

ceeded that of the House of Peers, (how much I do not exactly recollect), then these were a people able from wealth and influence to claim their rights, and then the king found that the house of Tudor had exercised an arbitrary power, not because the people had no laws to protect them, but because the laws had not the people. You will further observe that the house of Tudor had been arbitrary, but it did not attempt arbitrary power to a system like Charles I., it committed violations, it provoked, it receded, and it compromised. But the house of Stuart would be absolute in theory as well as in fact; it put, to use a law phrase, absolute power in issue, and insisted, not merely on taxing and arresting the subjects, but on their legal right to do so. Hume says, Charles conceived himself like other kings of Europe, or like his predecessors, and that he did not know the law. A man is indicted for sheep-stealing, and he answers he is no scholar, he never read the Parliament; but Charles had not so strong a case as the sheep-stealer, for Charles had given the royal assent to the very laws he broke; the petition of right, for instance, he gave his assent to in 1628, and the remnant of his life was a continued violation of it. Hume is every way unfortunate. The violation of his own laws was the principal cause for the famous but, I think, fatal remonstrance. The Parliament could not depend on him; they had a proof of it in his attempt to arrest the five members, the house sitting after they had obtained every security the law could give, and ever security except that which Charles could not give, good faith. That was the cause why they thought it necessary to depose the king; and you are to consider that remonstrance as no other than a preparatory act of doposition. There was another leading motive, religion; the Parliament was presbyterian, the king high church. In the bench of bishops the king saw God Almighty,—in the house, the devil. You recollect the treaty between the king and Parliament at Uxbridge: it took place when Cromwell left London; the Parliament broke off on account of the mitre, their concord was their existence, and their time a few days, they lost them in their dispute about the mitre, and were all destroyed by Cromwell, mitre, king, and parliament. This, which happened towards the close of the civil war, will help to show the motive at the beginning of it.—Ever yours,

H. GRATTAN.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick.

Stradbally, September 8th, 1805.

My dear Doctor,—I had rather be with you than here—but being here I cannot be with you.

I was obliged to leave Tinnehinch on Saturday to come on to this place, and desert your collection and all good works for the Mammon of unrighteousness, namely, rent; which the tenants pay like beggars, with land at a low rate, which does them no good.

I shall remain here some time, being to undergo an inspection* next Tuesday. I shall see you, however, very soon. Hardy is going to fair copy his work. I have not seen him since your letter arrived, as I left Tinnehinch an hour and three quarters after. When I see you I shall have much to hear from you, and you from me. In the mean time I can only say that I am, ever yours truly,

Henry Grattan.

Mr. Grattan to James Grattan.

Kilkenny, October 10th, 1805.

Your observations are just, I perceive you have derived benefit from your translation of Horace and your extracts of history. 'T is therefore worth your while to continue the latter. I am sure the more you write the more you will think, and the more you think the more you will exceed other men, who read more than they think (in general), and talk more than they read. I saw two schools at Kilkenny, their course is extensive; there is one rule I admire, they get by heart much of Virgil, much of Homer, much of Horace.

How is Dr. Leland, he sleeps a little himself, he has made me sleep very often, and yet he is the best Irish historian. Read over your extracts: the material and leading facts are not many, know them minutely.—Ever yours,

H. G.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick.

Dublin, October 24th, 1805.

My dear Doctor,—I cannot immediately go to you. We shall be happy to see you and Mrs. Berwick.

* Of yeomanry.

As to Swift, his picture I am glad you have gotten.* He was a Tory, and every thing that was said of him. £21 is a good deal for the works of such a man, when those of G. Howard, a much more loyal man, can be had for a few shillings—however, I will talk to you about them. Our friend Hardy is doing what he has been doing for these many years—nothing, and he is declining in spirits from the force of no object and no occupation: I despair of him.—Yours ever,

H. G.

SAME TO SAME.

Dublin, 23rd November, 1805.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—Three clergymen with me: one a dean and the other a bishop.† I cannot therefore think of going to an undignified divine for the present. Hereafter I will invade your parlour.

I shall call on Cox: I wish I had read his works. The week after next I will go to Esker. I hope your health is good. Pitt's victory‡ will secure us for the present, but I tremble at the gloomy prospect on the continent, between the delay of one power, and the precipitation of another, Europe is brought into danger very imminent, but not unforetold.—Farewell, yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

SAME TO SAME.

Dublin, December 19th, 1805.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—We shall expect you immediately after Christmas. Take care of Vesey's§ soul, I am glad his body is better, and that he is so much improved by the approach of death.

I hope he will now learn to have more charity for his brother Christians, and that he will not think to palliate the hardness of heart by excess of devotion.—Preston will meet you.—Yours,

H. G.

* Presented to him by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Plunket.

† Scott, Dean of Lismore; Beresford, Bishop of Kilmore, and both married to the Miss Bushes, his nieces.

‡ Naval action at Trafalgar, where the French were defeated, but Nelson was killed.

§ Colonel Vesey, a neighbour of Mr. Berwick's, very hostile to the Roman Catholics.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. PLOWDEN.

Tinnehinch, December 28th, 1805.

DEAR SIR,—It was not very long ago since I was favoured with your letter, together with your manly and able production. I postponed my acknowledgment of the former till I had made myself acquainted with the latter. You are one of the very few Irish historians who have ventured to deal in the commodity called truth. You have done it like a man, with vigour and ability against the tide of power and prejudice; you must look for the reward of merit in the censure of those whose censure is panegyric. As to the Union you must naturally think that you and I differ both as to the means used to obtain the Union, and the consequences to be looked for. Since the Union has taken place, we cannot differ.

We must own the former to have been execrable, and hope the latter may be fortunate; that is, that the Union may be attended with the indiscriminating adoption of all the king's subjects.

How much, therefore, did I feel in reading that part of your letter of which I shall not mention one word—for very far from owing his crown to these ministers, it was they who brought it into peril—they acknowledged they made the rebellion *explode*, that is, break out—they had before excited the disaffection. The French and the United Irish would never have made the people rebel, if both had not been assisted by the administration. Such an administration in England would have made a rebellion there too. The greatest honour that can be done Lord Camden, is to say the system was extorted from him; his successor, Lord Hardwicke has abated much of its fury, and allegiance advances as the system retires. Some of those who attempted to write the history of Ireland are men who sold themselves and their country. Their history is their apology, not a recitation of facts. They are bigots and they are slaves, bought and sold. Your history carries on it the characteristic stamp that it was written by a freeman.—I beg to conclude that I am with great respect your very faithful humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

Francis Plowden, Esq.

A great change took place at this period in public affairs;* and after a lapse of 24 years, Mr. Fox returned to power in February, 1806. The battle of Austerlitz killed his rival. Worn out by the cares of state, the disappointments that attended his plans, and the failure of his continental coalitions, Mr. Pitt's† strength gave way, and he fell a victim to his office. Mr. Fox succeeded him, and formed a new administration.

* Pitt Administration, as it stood in January, 1806.

Cabinet Ministers.

President of the Council, Earl Camden.
Lord High Chancellor, Lord Eldon.
Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Westmoreland.
First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer (Prime Minister), Right Hon. William Pitt.
First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Barham.
Master General of the Ordnance, Earl of Chatham.
Secretary of State for the Home Department, Lord Hawkesbury.
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Mulgrave.
Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies, and President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India, Lord Viscount Castlereagh.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Harrowby.

Not of the Cabinet.

Secretary at War, Right Hon. William Dundas.
Treasurer of the Navy, Right Hon. George Canning.
Joint Paymasters of his Majesty's Forces, Right Hon. George Rose, Right Hon. Lord Charles Somerset.
Joint Paymasters-General, Duke of Montrose, Lord Charles Spencer.
Secretaries of the Treasury, William Huskisson, Esq., W. Sturges Bourne, Esq.
Master of the Rolls, Sir William Grant.
Attorney-General, Hon. Spencer Perceval.
Solicitor-General, Sir Vicary Gibbs.

Persons in the Ministry in Ireland.

Lord Lieutenant, Earl of Hardwicke.
Lord High Chancellor, Lord Redesdale.
Chief Secretary, Right Hon. Charles Long.
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. John Foster.
Attorney-General, Right Hon. William Conyngham Plunket.
Solicitor-General, Charles Kendal Bushe.

* † He died on the 23rd of January, 1806, aged forty-seven, on the day that, twenty-five years before, he had taken his seat in Parliament.

Fox Administration, as it stood in *February*, 1806.

President of the Council, Earl Fitzwilliam.
Lord High Chancellor, Lord Erskine.
Lord Privy Seal, Viscount Sidmouth.
First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister), Lord Grenville.
First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Howick (late Mr. Grey).
Master General of the Ordnance, Earl of Moira.
Secretary of State for the Home Department, Earl Spencer.
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Right Hon. Charles James Fox.
Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies, Right Hon. William Windham.
Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, Lord Ellenborough.
Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer, Lord Henry Petty.

The above formed the Cabinet.

President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India, Lord Minto.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Earl of Derby.
President of the Board of Trade, Lord Auckland.
Secretary at War, Right Hon. Richard Fitzpatrick.
Treasurer of the Navy, Right Hon. Richard Brinsley Sheridan.
Joint Paymasters-General, Earl Temple, Lord John Townshend.
Joint Postmasters-General, Earl of Buckinghamshire, Earl of Carysfort.
Secretaries of the Treasury, Right Hon. Nicholas Vansittart, John King, Esq.
Master of the Rolls, Sir William Grant.
Attorney-General, Sir Arthur Pigott.
Solicitor-General, Sir Samuel Romilly.

Persons in the Ministry in Ireland.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Duke of Bedford.
Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, Right Hon. George Ponsonby.
Chief Secretary of Ireland, Hon. William Elliot.
Chancellor of Exchequer of Ireland, Right Hon. Sir J. Newport.
Attorney-General of Ireland, William Conyngham Plunket.
Solicitor-General of Ireland, Charles Kendal Bushe.

CHAPTER IX.

The Duke of Bedford sent to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant.—Conduct of the Whig administration.—Great expectations of the Irish people.—Disappointed.—Mr. Fox's remarks as to the repeal of the Union.—Treatment of Hardy and Curran.—Mr. Tierney.—His character.—Conduct of the Catholics.—Letter of Mr. Grattan.—Refuses office.—Mr. Fox's letter as to the Catholics.—Letter of the Lord Lieutenant.—Letter of Mr. Grattan on the study of history.—To Mr. Berwick on Irish appointments.—To M'Can on ditto.—To Hamilton Rowan as to Mr. Sampson.—To M'Can as to Curran.—Fletcher and Hardy.—As to Mr. Fox's health.—Lord Lieutenant to Mr. Grattan on the death of Fox.—Mr. Grattan to the Secretary of the Board of Education on that subject.—Sir John Newport on ditto.—General election.—Mr. Grattan declining Lord Fitzwilliam's offer to be returned for an English borough, sets up for Dublin.—Is elected.—His speech.—Letter of Mr. Keogh.—Ditto of Duke of Bedford.—Mrs. Grattan to Mr. Hartley, refusing the subscription to defray the expenses of election.—Lord Fitzwilliam to Mr. Grattan.

GREAT expectations were entertained by the popular party on the accession of Mr. Fox to power, in 1806. He sent the Duke of Bedford to Ireland, as Lord-Lieutenant,—a man of noble descent, of great family—a name consecrated in history, imbued with an hereditary attachment to liberty and to the just rights of the people—mild in his manners, gentle and pleasing in his disposition, of good principles, and of high honour.

The Irish people, however, were not now to be deceived by outward appearances or private professions. They conceived, not only that constitutional principles would be asserted, but national feelings would be gratified, national services rewarded, and the enemies of the country brought forth and punished; that her injuries, so long

accumulating, would be redressed, and the insults, so deeply inflicted, would at length be avenged. But these hopes were vain; the bright visions the people had formed quickly vanished, and the country was doomed to be again disappointed.

Mr. Fox had spoken of the Union, not only as if he thought it should be repealed, but as if he meant to repeal it,* and as if he wished the people to think so; and he certainly had in private given his friends cause for entertaining such an opinion. At first he said that he would create a board of Irishmen to consider what measures were best for Ireland: he said it was necessary, but he did not appoint one. He offered the place of Commander of the Forces to an Irishman;—Lord Hutchinson refused, but he persuaded him to accept it, and then he permitted it to be given to another.

Unquestionably, if the Protestants were not to be gratified by the restoration of their Parliament, and the Catholics were not to be gratified by the

* On the 3rd of February, Lord Castlereagh proposed that a monument should be erected to the memory of Lord Cornwallis, who had died in India in 1805, and he alluded in his speech to the services he had rendered in effecting the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. Mr. O'Hara, an Irish member, said that he could not vote personal honours to the memory of a man who had taken so principal a part in that transaction, which he looked on as mischievous and fatal to the interests of Ireland. Mr. Fox said, he voted for it with some satisfaction, as the words *excellent statesman* were not in the motion; he voted for it notwithstanding what had been said on the act of Union, for considering that act with all the circumstances attending it, he thought it to be one of the most disgraceful that ever happened in that country. In consequence of these remarks, Mr. Harry Alexander, a follower of Lord Castlereagh, and a ready unscrupulous actor in that corrupt and flagitious proceeding, asked Mr. Fox, some days after, to explain himself more fully on the subject, as his words might have been misunderstood and might be taken to mean an intention to repeal that act; on which Mr. Fox observed, that he adhered to all he had said, but had not spoken prospectively—that there were many measures which were originally bad, yet could not be remedied by the repeal of them, and that, however bad the measures had been, an attempt to repeal it without the most urgent solicitation from the parties interested should not be made, and hitherto none such had come within his knowledge.

restoration of their privileges, they might at least have expected that their disappointment would have been lessened by beholding the marked disgrace of their enemies; and they might have felt some consolation in finding their future apprehensions removed by cleansing the bench of magistrates, and dismissing from office and power those who had persecuted the people.

But it seemed that the Union was not to be repealed, that the Catholics were not to be emancipated, and that the friends of the Irish people were not to be rewarded. Worse than that, the old enemies of the country were to be left in the enjoyment of honour, office, and emolument. This was a fatal precedent to set; and any Government that left such an example behind, could never upbraid the country afterwards with popular ingratitude. It was certain to be imitated, and could not escape the keen observation of the Prince Regent, who practised it in 1812,—fatally for his friends—more fatally for his reputation.

The charges brought against the Whig administration were numerous; and, unfortunately, some of them were well founded. It was stated, and with reason, that they should not have tolerated such men as Duigenan, Musgrave, Sirr, Swan, Fitzgerald;* but have made a public example of such bad characters, have openly punished them, and avenged the excesses of the insurrection; that they should not have suffered such persons as Mr. Mayne to be appointed judge, Mr. Grierson to hold office; and leave the secretary of their Whig club unrewarded, and Hardy and Curran remain so long unprovided for; that Berwick, a humane, independent, and exemplary

* Giffard had been removed by Lord Hardwicke, but on the return of the Tories was restored with full salary from the time of his removal.

clergyman (ill-treated by Lord Corhampton on account of his kindness and attention to the tortured Irish in 1798*), should want a bishopric, while Warburton, a favourite and without claims, should get one.

It was said that they had not rewarded the friends of the Irish party—the men who had sacrificed so much at the Union, so much on the Catholic question—who remained unseduced by the bribes of Castlereagh, and unawed by the threats of Clare—in fact, who had resisted every temptation, and whom they should have made it a point of honour at every hazard to advance. That such men as Mr. Dundas and Taylor were made Commissioners, while Hardy, and Fletcher,† and Preston were delayed, postponed, or overlooked. It was said that Hardy was not sufficiently active; but the appointment of the others showed that the business did not require any great attention, or any extraordinary talent. It was said that objections were made to Curran; but Curran was promised the office of Attorney-General, and it was afterwards alleged that his character was the impediment; yet it was good enough to permit him to be a judge, the second place offered to him. All this was done without communicating with any one on the subject. Thus, the party committed two faults,—breach of promise to Curran, and misconduct to the public, in making a judge a person whose reputation they alleged to be too bad to allow him to be Attorney-General; though, in truth, this *talk* about Curran (for it deserves no other name) was a calumny of the Tories, because of his patriotism and firmness in

* See *ante*, vol. iv. p. 332, for Lord Corhampton's conduct towards him.

† Fletcher was one of the few judges who had an idea of liberty. Mr. Grattan used to say of him, "I like his growl better than other men's good humour."

1798, and was used by the Whigs for political convenience.

In addition to this the country was encumbered with a debt, as the Master of the Rolls, who made way for Curran, was allowed a retiring salary. They also divided the Boards of Custom and Excise; and instead of consolidating small offices, they augmented them. So far from regarding their friends, when a place was vacant at the Board of Customs, it was given away from Hardy. Again, when another place fell vacant—a place of 500*l.* a year, which was wealth to a person circumstanced as poor Hardy was—they wanted also to give this away, and it was with difficulty procured for Hardy, through the exertions of Lady Granard. They wanted to make Mr. Tierney, an Englishman, Chancellor of the Irish Exchequer: but this was stopped by Mr. Grattan. They then made Lord Grenville, an Englishman also (the proposer of the Union in the House of Lords), First Lord of the Irish Treasury, in place of an Irishman to whom that honour was due. The Irish Parliament, in order to have some power over the dispensation of the public money, had created this treasury at the expense of 6,000*l.* a year, and had placed at its head an Irishman; and now the Whig administration, in order forsooth to render Ireland *more independent*, put at its head an absentee and an Englishman; thus binding the Union even faster than Pitt had done.

It must be said that these were not very great things, nor matters of much consequence; yet they sufficed to prove the disposition of the Government and tried the affection of the British party for their Irish friends and former supporters. Following, too, so close upon the Union, they were a proof of the indifference of one party and the inferiority of the other, and served to show

that Ireland had, as a nation, become a blank, and had sunk, not only in name, but in reality.

The Whig Government were quite mistaken in the line of policy they adopted. Their plan was oblivion, and Mr. Fox wished to forgive. It was a sentiment congenial to his nature, and in his own case he would have acted on it and succeeded; but in that of others, and of a country that till late had been a nation, it was quite different: a nation rarely forgets. Besides, as a leader he was wrong; for if a party seeks to govern popularly, they must enter into the feelings of the people,—they must consult men's passions, and give them a triumph. The cold system never succeeds: there may be many good arguments for it, but the people will not understand them. They behold in power the men who abused, the men who flogged, and the men who tortured; and certainly that person is a very shallow politician, if not a very wicked one, who on such occasions leaves both impunity and their spoils to incorrigible offenders. In this respect the Whigs were fatally in the wrong; they seemed impressed with the romantic idea that they could make vicious enemies virtuous friends; and that Major Sirr and Major Swan could walk about the Castle, and feed on the wages of their crimes, while their noblest supporters starved upon hunger and their conscience.

It is true that Lord Grenville was Prime Minister, and Ireland was not in Mr. Fox's department, he was Secretary for Foreign affairs, but yet he did not attend to her as he might, and as she expected, and he took office as Pitt had done without stipulating for the Catholic question. This, however, Pitt had made a difficulty almost insuperable. Mr. Grattan found him on these subjects quite insensible—he had no meeting about

Ireland—he held no Cabinet Council about her—he did not consult Lord Hutchinson, though he respected him much—he never consulted Mr. Grattan, though he personally liked him (yet on one occasion he yielded when Mr. Grattan remonstrated with him on the subject of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer* for Ireland). He conferred with George Ponsonby merely on the arrangement about places, which Ponsonby liked, but he did not ask who were to be provided for. Mr. Grattan spoke to him about Curran and Hardy, and mentioned that he understood that the latter was to be one of the Commissioners of the Revenue. Fox merely replied, that he was glad of it; in fact, on the subject of Ireland, Fox was cold and mistaken. Yet this did not arise from want of regard for Ireland, or want of principle, or want of heart—the good feeling was there—he loved Mr. Grattan, he respected Lord Hutchinson—but the difficulty was almost insuperable—it was the Union—it was the weight of business overwhelmed him, and the addition of Ireland, that rendered the office too laborious and the load too heavy for any minister to bear; besides this, a fatal destiny hung over a people who had suffered themselves to be divided and to be sold, and the workings of the Union began to

* Mr. Grattan conceived it to be his duty, however painful, to oppose the appointment of Mr. Tierney to the office of Chancellor to the Irish Exchequer. He was an able Englishman, and a strong and excellent speaker; his style was that of conversation, but there was not a single sentence thrown away,—he was always sure of his aim, and certain to hit severely, singularly, and unexpectedly. He was a man of spirit and of dignity; his reply to Sir Francis Burdett, who had charged him with "*having his pockets stuffed with public plunder*," was inimitable, unanswered, and unanswerable. Tierney was a man who seemed not to know what folly was,—nothing could get him to talk nonsense, except time—that alone could beat him. In private he was most agreeable; he had a wit and archness in what he said, that pleased and never offended. It might be supposed that he possessed great judgment; it was quite the reverse,—he had no discretion; and though a man of spirit, was not a man of bold counsel.

make themselves visible in the gradual debasement of the country that nature had made too large to be governed as a province. The position, also, of Mr. Fox, and his declining health, depressed him; the hand of death was upon him, and another more chilling and more deadly still,—a king sworn against his people.

Unfortunately the Whigs disclosed one of the great *arcana imperii*—that they did not object to increase of expense, and did not dislike influence more than the Tories. Still it must be admitted that, although they deserved blame for their conduct as to Ireland, they did many excellent acts,—the abolition of the slave trade, the training bill (a great constitutional measure), the limited service bill, the attempt (almost success) at making peace with France, the friendly disposition towards the Catholics, the immediate removal of Lord Chancellor Redesdale,* the restoring Mr. Fox and Mr. Grattan to the Privy Council, the allowing the act for the suspension of the habeas corpus bill to expire, by which a number of persons imprisoned for years under the despotic and inquisitorial system of their predecessors, were thereby liberated, and restored to health and freedom.

Certainly they did not increase the affections of the Catholics towards England, who now began to view the party with distrust and suspicion; and although the inclination of the Whigs was known to be favourable, yet the Catholics began to look on their friends almost as enemies, strove to force their claims upon Parliament, and

* He was dismissed on the 4th of March—it affected him even to tears; he concluded his farewell address to the bar, by complaining of those who had concurred in his dismissal; "This," said he, "was what I did not expect, and what I was not prepared to bear;" he then added, "to this country I have the highest sense of obligation, I do not know that in a single instance I have experienced anything but kindness!" In what a noble and generous light does not the nation appear that from its opponent receives such praise!

drive them to an extremity, and at their meetings held out the language of threats and defiance. But this was not peculiar to the Catholics; it arose from the restless and dissatisfied nature of man; and in justice to that much-abused and ill-treated body, it must be said that ultimately they listened to the advice of Mr. Fox, and did not embarrass the Government by petitioning.

It is to be observed, also, that the Whigs were too short a time in power to judge of them, and they did not get a fair trial; rather they had no trial at all, and in truth they had very little power,—the King was against them, the people of England were not for them, the Catholics embarrassed them, Ireland was a drag, not an assistance, and unfortunately the party subsequently decided the King still more against them, for they pressed him on a minor point,—a little question that would not have gratified the people, and was great enough to displease the King.

But to return to the correspondence: when the following letter was written my brother and I were in the Queen's County. My father had appointed me first lieutenant in his corps of yeomanry, and my occupation was to drill the men four times a week, with the assistance of a sergeant of the line. In a short time they grew very expert, and could go through most of Dundas's manœuvres (the military book then in use), were remarkably good shots, and proved a most efficient body,—liked by the people and on terms of friendship (as before stated) with the Orangemen.

The joy in Ireland on the accession of the Whigs to power was very great, particularly among the Catholics. The idea that Mr. Grattan was to form one of the administration diffused satisfaction and confidence: some rejoiced from private reasons, many from public; for the people, who cannot see the interior of Government, form

their opinions from outward appearances. About four o'clock one morning we were awoke by an express from Dublin, informing us that Mr. Grattan had been appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer. We thanked the individual who had volunteered to bring the news, but we disbelieved his story, and turned on our side to sleep.

We knew that Mr. Grattan would not accept office, and that his feelings in 1806 were just as in 1782 and 1795; as he then expressed them,—"*to be consulted, not considered.*" He was restored to the Privy Council, and he could there advise; but his refusal of office was much canvassed, and many deemed him to have acted wrong. Certainly he would not have made a first-rate Chancellor of the Exchequer; he was not the best man of business, and disliked accounts and detail. At the same time most of the business is done by the underlings,—those long in office, trained to its ways, and versed in its habits; and of late years has been so much simplified, that men of a very inferior mental grade have held the situation. But Mr. Grattan's great objection was to feel himself indebted to any party, or to be placed under the slightest obligation to any minister, which the acceptance of office is too often considered to imply; besides, he saw that the Whigs had but a slight tenure of office, that their lease of it would be broken by their royal landlord on the first pretence, or on any alleged breach of covenant; in short, he knew that the King could not be trusted. The difficulty, too, of uniting Irish and English politics was considerable. He would have had to teach the British Cabinet every point, and instruct them on each particular subject of Irish affairs, which they were seldom much disposed to pay attention to, and never inclined to study and to master. If the office of Chief Secretary had

been pressed upon him, the case would have been somewhat, but not very different; he could strike out a comprehensive plan and enforce a broad national principle of imperial benefit, and carry it into effect with high determination; but that was precisely what a British Government would not have allowed, their object being ever to keep in British hands the reins of Irish government. So strongly was this sentiment prevailing, that on one occasion even Charles Fox was said to have observed to Lord Fitzwilliam, that "*Grattan was too Irish for the English Parliament.*" The mere circumstance of being in office would not, in all probability, have added much weight to his principles or his advice. We may see from these letters how little they were listened to as far as public appointments for Irish services were concerned; and the temporizing policy has of late years been fully exemplified in the practice of neutralizing every government that leaned towards the people. If a friendly Lord-Lieutenant were appointed, he was overruled or thwarted by a Secretary of a different or hostile disposition, and so *vice versâ*. This system, so prevalent even latterly, serves to prove what a difficulty must have existed in 1806, when the anti-Irish and the High Church party still held sway. On the whole, Mr. Grattan acted with wisdom, and it cannot be said that he deserted his party or the country, for he was at all times ready and willing to assist and to advise; but the practice and policy of the British minister has never been to take counsel from an Irishman.

MR. GRATTAN TO JAMES GRATTAN.

6, Bentinck Street, Manchester Square, Feb. 16, 1806.

DEAR JAMES,—Your mother wrote to you on the receipt of your letter to me, otherwise I should have written myself.

You see every thing is settled regarding the new ministry—they are sworn and gazetted. The Irish Lord Lieutenant, his Secretary, and Chancellor, and Keeper are all fixed. I refused office, I do not know whether you think I was right. We hear that there are disturbances in the County of Mayo. What is the fact?—let me know. Give me an account of your Queen's County expedition. Were you at Tyrawly's?—How is he? It is now nine o'clock, and as black as Erebus: I can hardly see the paper. No foreign news of any consequence; indeed, the news was so bad it was impossible any thing further more extraordinary or calamitous could happen.

I have resumed this letter, after many interruptions, so that it wants the merit of continuity. Let me know what you and Henry are now reading. I observe that the English have most of the brilliant passages in English and Latin poetry, Virgil and Juvenal, &c. &c., by heart—they should add Homer, it gives a great spirit to conversation. I wish you would keep in your memory what you have already gotten by heart. It is a foolish thing to lose what you have already spent so much time to acquire.

Mr. Fox is well—I hope he may be long so. He is a fair, direct, honest man: he still loves to talk of poetry and repeat verses, which he remembers well. Pitt's death was, what you say, a great surprise: and his life, like his death, very different from his father's. The affairs on the continent were as ill planned as they were ill executed—they had no chance of success from the first—this appears from the papers now laid before Parliament.—Yours affectionately, H. G.

The subjoined letter is the best document from Mr. Fox that is to be met with in the transactions of this period. It shows, as has been already stated, that the intentions of Mr. Fox were good; but they were to be carried into effect by others; and Lord Sidmouth and Lord Ellenborough * in the British Cabinet, and the Orange party in official situations in Ireland, were bad instruments

* Lord Sidmouth was Privy Seal, a violent opponent of the Catholics, and quite in the good graces of the King; Lord Grenville was Lord of both Treasuries; Lord Ellenborough was Chief Justice, *with a seat in the Cabinet;* all of them strong in favour of the Union.

wherewith to accomplish his just and charitable wishes; and, in fact, none of the measures he writes about were carried into effect. The account of these matters was as follows:—Mr. James Ryan, a respectable Roman Catholic merchant, but a young man of inconsiderable standing in politics, yet not without public spirit, had assembled several meetings at his private house on the subject of Catholic affairs. He thought fit to write to Mr. Fox on those matters, as well as on some affairs relating to himself. Mr. Fox replied in the kindest manner; and when his letter was produced at a public meeting of Roman Catholics, a warm debate and much difference of opinion arose; private and unseemly altercations broke forth, the policy of pressing the Catholic question was discussed at great length and with much vehemence, and in the end the committee decided that Mr. Fox's suggestion should be acceded to, and that it would be inexpedient to urge upon the Government the consideration of the Catholic claims. A general meeting was subsequently held at the Repository in Stephen's Green, in which a resolution condemning the practice of holding meetings on the subject of Catholic affairs in the houses of private individuals was carried, after a long and stormy discussion. This being effected, and the public cause being so far secured, an adjournment took place, and the Whigs were relieved from the embarrassment in which the affairs of Ireland threatened to involve them.

Such was the condition to which she was reduced under the British Government; but if she had preserved her own free institutions uninfluenced and uncorrupted, and had guarded herself against foreign and domestic traitors, her Catholic question would have been carried in an hour, and her people would have enjoyed peace.

MR. FOX TO MR. RYAN.

Downing Street, February 18th, 1806.

DEAR SIR,—I owe you many apologies for not having sooner written, as I promised you to do, in a short letter from St. Anne's Hill, or answered your last. With regard to your last, I have given it to Lord Henry Petty, who has promised to attend to it, and who will, no doubt, (unless unforeseen difficulties should arise) be happy to comply with your wishes.* With respect to the question you put to me about the presentation of a Catholic petition this year, I have consulted with our friends, who all agree in thinking that, for the interest of the cause, such a measure ought to be deferred to another session. Measures are actually taken, by the removal of Lord Redesdale, Mr. Foster, and others, to show the good intentions of the ministry towards your body. Steps still more important will be taken to manifest our disposition, by doing for the Catholics all that is consistent with bad laws, by giving them in substance what they have only in words, a right to be in the army, to be corporators, &c. &c., *by a change of justices of the peace*, whose conduct has been notoriously oppressive, I hope too by some arrangement about tithes, and, in fine, by giving you all the share in the Government of your country that we can give. The effect of these measures will be partly to make the Catholics of the lower orders more satisfied, partly to enable them to come with additional strength and weight when they again assert their claims. I therefore strongly recommend suspending the petition for a time. If, however, it should notwithstanding our wishes be presented, I shall support it with all my power, but the division of last year, and the opinions which have been industriously propagated in this country, make me despair of success, unless we could have active assistance from a quarter in which to look for passive acquiescence,† is perhaps more than we can reasonably expect. If we are beat, which we certainly shall be, and if the fall of our ministry should follow, which may be the case, you run the risk of a ministry being formed on the avowed principle of defeating your claims, and thus you would put all hope further off than ever.—I am, with great regard, dear Sir, yours ever,

CHARLES JAMES FOX.

* He had applied for a place. † The King.

The two following letters show the little influence Mr. Grattan had with Government. The applications on behalf of Hardy and M'Can were on public grounds; he never at any time asked of Government a personal favour. Strange to say, he failed in both these cases; one individual was never provided for, and the other, as his letters show, was sadly disappointed, and at last, at the end of a year, by chance succeeded, not through the influence of Mr. Grattan, but of a lady of the house of Granard. Such was the value set upon Irish services, Irish virtue, Irish privations, and Mr. Grattan's disinterested recommendations. Coldness and indifference of this sort sunk the Whig party in Ireland for ever.

The remarks of the Duke of Bedford as to the Catholics refer to their various meetings and discordant debates; but subsequently their conduct met with his approbation, and towards the close of his government, a highly complimentary resolution was passed by that body in favour of his Grace.

Let these documents, and others of a similar nature in the collection, be a lesson to all men in after ages, and teach them to serve their country with true Spartan spirit,—devoid of all selfish considerations, seeking no object but her good, and asking no reward but her approbation. Posterity is sure to award the palm where it is justly due; for see, in every free country the memory of Hardy and of Curran is admired and respected, while that of Clare and Castlereagh is abhorred and execrated.

THE LORD LIEUTENANT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Private. Dublin Castle, February 19th, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—Since I had the pleasure of seeing you, I have anxiously occupied my mind on a provision for

Mr. M'Can, in some department where his talents may be usefully employed in the service of Government, but I am sorry to add, that my inquiries have hitherto proved unsatisfactory; every situation connected with the press is in the hands of persons whom it would be difficult to remove. And, indeed, these offices are, generally speaking, so inferior in point of value, as to be inadequate to Mr. M'Can's fair expectations, should he give up the office he now holds in the revenue. If, however, you can point out to me any mode in which the object you have in view may reasonably be accomplished, I shall most cheerfully avail myself of any suggestions you may offer.

I fear the determination of the Catholic body will lead to great embarrassment, and produce in this country a ferment and irritation, which it will be difficult to allay. I think they are pursuing a line of conduct injurious to their own interests, and I very deeply regret it.—Ever, my dear Sir, with the truest regard, your very faithful and obedient servant,

BEDFORD.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. HARDY.

London, February 20th, 1806.

Letters should begin at the bottom, with a postscript, in which the subject is contained.—

MY DEAR HARDY,—Your name was mentioned by me, and I must tell you the truth.—

You are now in a great perspiration—turn over.—

Your claim was acknowledged *una voce* by your *Irish friends*—my wishes anticipated. Moira had mentioned you to Mr. Fox. I think your quantum is very reasonable, and I make no doubt it will be settled to your satisfaction. —Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

I suppose many will be discontented, for it is impossible to do what one would wish for all—it cannot be helped. There is nothing new, at least nothing except what you read in the paper. I cannot tell you much. I must not

tell secrets, and must affect mystery, and, of course, must be short and unsatisfactory. But with regard to yourself I hope not so.

This letter was written in a droll way, on four large sheets of paper, to tantalize Hardy; but this innocent suspense was of little moment and short duration, compared to what he was doomed to suffer; and that public-spirited man who had spurned in the midst of poverty all Lord Castlereagh's splendid offers, was left unaided for upwards of a year, and was, on the accidental death of Mr. Preston, named one of the commissioners of appeal—an onerous place for Hardy, of only 500*l.* a year—just before the Whigs left office.

By way of preface to Mr. Grattan's remarks on the study of history, it may be observed that he preferred domestic to public education, and was averse to sending his children to public schools; their dissipation, their vice, and their extravagance, deterred him; perhaps, too, he thought that an education in another country somewhat tended to alienate young persons from Ireland, and to estrange their habits, their tastes, and their dispositions, from their native land. There were only two schools of much repute at this period in Ireland,—Dr. Pack's at Kilkenny, and Mr. Carpenter's at Armagh; but in general neither the Irish nobility nor the Irish gentry sent their sons there. A preposterous and provincial idea was long prevalent in Ireland, namely, that young persons could form acquaintances at English schools and colleges who would assist them in after life; and as England was the seat of power, parents looked for the promotion of their children to British aid instead of Irish ability.

Hence proceeded that servile and grovelling sentiment, and that anti-national feeling that unfortunately has so much characterised the upper classes

of the people of Ireland. Most of them in past times were adventurers or the descendants of adventurers, they lacked the vigorous quality that would have enabled them to take a firm root and spread and flourish in the new soil, and they suffered themselves in action, and thought, and word, and *utterance*, to be drawn back insensibly perhaps, but ignobly, towards the mother country. They possessed some of Swift's feelings without his spirit; like him they objected to rest "*in the land of slaves*," but unlike him they did not seek to make their countrymen free; they pretended that more liberal principles and a more liberal education was to be procured in England, forgetting that of this evil they were themselves the authors; that the error lay with them, and that they should have eradicated from their minds as well as their acts the causes that had occasioned this reproach and calamity; namely, their domestic differences and divisions, their civil, religious, and political debasement, their want of national port, and spirit, and sentiment, and, above all, that absence of dignity and self-respect, which made them meanly fly for further and continual instruction to the very people who had uniformly propagated every anti-Irish feeling and encouraged every anti-national tendency.

In his family Mr. Grattan took much pains to procure the best preceptors, but he did not wholly trust to their exertions; he shared them in person, and particularly in the branches of Latin, Greek, and English classics; and let it not be imagined that the moral and religious part of a parent's duty was not carefully attended to. Numerous and invidious attacks were made upon him, with regard to his religious principles and sentiments, as they had been to his political ones, and this too even in latter days: both were wholly devoid

of truth, and, as by this time, the reader must be satisfied that the latter have been refuted, here we have the refutation of the former, for it may with perfect truth be said, that under the roof of Tinnehinch, morality and religion were inculcated and exercised with undissembled sincerity, and without affectation or fanaticism. On these points, Mr. Grattan's instructions were profound and remarkable: given with such steady seriousness, such agreeable composure, deep, solemn, and, at the same time so natural, so devoid of harshness and puritanism, that the impression they left could never be effaced. On one occasion his discourse thus ended—"never scoff at or speak lightly of religion, never associate with those who do, and should such an occurrence happen in your presence, and that you cannot answer, leave the company immediately." Much more might be said on this subject, but the charges that have been revived, even since the appearance of the first of these volumes, carry with them, in their extravagance, their own refutation. The private history and the cause of these attacks are well known to the author, but it is not necessary for the reader to be troubled with any further refutation.*

MR. GRATTAN TO HENRY GRATTAN, JUN.

London, 20th February, 1806.

MY DEAR HENRY,—* * * The best rules for study are, I think, the following—RISE EARLY, and give five or six hours to study every day, days of sporting excepted; make yourself master of the Roman, Greek, English, and Irish

* The allusion here is to the *Dublin Review* for September, 1843, where a very malignant and groundless attack is founded on an early letter of Mr. Grattan's to Mr. Broome (an eccentric character); it was written in order to draw from him an extravagant defence of a fictitious argument, a line of disputation adopted for amusement and literary pastime; but it is absurdly taken as representing his fixed opinion.

Hardy, who saw the interior of Tinnehinch, used to say, "How can people imagine Mr. Grattan is not sufficiently religious! If my poor knees could speak, they would tell how long he has kept me on them!"

history. The books are principally Hook, Vertot, Mitford, Stanian, Hume, Parliamentary history, Leland, Carte, Polybius, Plutarch, Herodotus, Livy, and Tacitus. The histories are to be divided into heads, and are to be read, not regularly, for that would be intolerable, but to points. For instance, in the Roman history, the Constitution—first Kingly, then Consular, then the progress of the popular power, from Consuls to Tribunes, to the right of trying the nobility, to the right of sharing in the consular, &c.; then to the dissolution of the Constitution, under the Gracchi and about their death, by its excesses under Pompey and Cæsar, by its special commissions, as well as by the general consequences of too much power, and too much wealth. You will also advert to the progress of Empire, from the disputes with Alba to the second Punic war, which ascertained Italy, and gave Africa: from that conquest to the Macedonian war, which gave Greece: from that domination to the Asiatic war, and that with Antiochus, which gave Syria, and advanced the Empire to Mount Taurus: then to the second Macedonian war, which provincialized Macedon, and to the corollary of that war, the Achæn war, which enslaved the Greeks: then to the fate of the King of Pontus, and the farthest stretch of the Roman Empire eastward. Then the progress of the Empire in the west: the Gallic war, you need not trouble yourself about the different battles, but you must know the decisive actions in those wars, the causes, or rather the pretences for these wars, and the extent of the Empire resulting from each. You have the plan already, similar to the contractions of the Irish civil wars, and the English history under Charles the First, you have only to fill it up with the productive facts in history, without loading your memory with trifling transactions. Trifling transactions I call all the battles and wars of the Romans till the second Punic war, the sacking of Rome by the Gauls, and the siege of Veii excepted, even the transactions in the great wars, several of them are to read but not dwelt on. Much of the progress of Quintius, in the first Macedonian war, which is finely told by Livy, is uninteresting, so of the Mithridatic, so of the Asiatic wars; but the decisive battles, the extent of dominion in consequence, the pretences, and any brilliant episode. I will conclude this letter in a day or two on another sheet.

H. G.

MR. GRATTAN TO HENRY GRATTAN, JUN.

22nd February, 1806.

MY DEAR HENRY,—With regard to the subject of the other letter, did I omit to mention that for style, you should study Bolingbroke's Political Works, Junius, and Burke, with the Parliamentary remonstrances in the Parliamentary history in Charles the First's time. The great study is history, and the most essential study, the history of your own times, and the most events are—the French war, its causes, errors, and consequences, in which you must peruse Belsham, and the Parliamentary Debates, and the Annual Register of '92, and so on. The next great event is the American war, its causes, errors, and consequences, for which you are to study the same Tracts, Parliamentary Debates, and the Registers of '75, '77, and so on to '83. The next greatest question is the Irish Revolution of 1782, and the Irish Union of 1800—the Tracts are not to be found, you must collect them from oral testimony.

Another great question, the Middlesex election, the tracts are the Parliamentary Debates of '69 and 70. Most of these events you know already, you have only to register, digest, and write them in a clear *full hand.*

The material events of the two anteceding reigns, George the First and George the Second, are the seven years' war, the treaties of Seville, Hanover, and Vienna, (James will tell you what they are), and the accession of the Hanover Family.

You will find in the Parliamentary Debates, and in the Annual Register, these subjects. Observe in the Parliamentary Debates of that time, that there are but five great questions, and four great speakers (debaters), for they are no more, viz.—The continuation of a standing army, the septennial bill, the excise, and the Spanish convention; and the debaters are—Sir Robert Walpole, Sir William Wyndham, Sir John Barnard, and Mr. Pulteney. James will tell you how to read those debates, and you will go through them with great expedition, most of the subjects being now (and most of the arguments being) either confirmed or refuted by the experiment.—Ever yours,

H. G.

Mr. Wallace, who forms the subject of the

Secretary's letter, was considered by Mr. Grattan as deserving of consideration upon public grounds. He had taken a zealous, a ready, and a useful part at the period of the Union, and as before observed, had written, and with effect, against the measure; this too atthe time that he be held others highly rewarded for supporting it. Independent of this strong recommendation, Mr. Wallace was then liberal in his politics, and friendly to the Roman Catholics and to their claims. He was not only an able and distinguished lawyer, but a person of considerable taste in literature. At his house many clever individuals used to meet, and were received with great hospitality and friendship. Mr. Grattan was often one of the number, and always retained a grateful recollection of the agreeable hours spent in that society.

THE LORD LIEUTENANT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Dublin Castle, March 14th, 1806.

DEAR SIR,—Mr. Elliot has informed me of your anxious desire that Mr. Wallace should be included in the promotion to the rank of King's Councillor, and, immediately on being apprised of your wishes, I communicated with the Chancellor on the subject, who informs me, that from Mr. Wallace's standing at the bar, he cannot take upon himself to recommend him for promotion, without giving great offence to others, who have, as he conceives, higher pretensions, and that he has written to you fully upon it. The Chancellor being, from his situation, the opinion by which it is my duty to be guided in all cases connected with the profession of which he is the head, I have only to express the great regret I feel at being placed in a situation, which compels me to a decision contrary to your wishes and request. I am persuaded you will give full credit to the sincerity of this feeling, and I beg you will believe me, with truth and regard, my dear Sir, most faithfully yours,

BEDFORD.

Mr. Grattan's opinion as to the merits and claims of Mr. Berwick—the inattention observed towards

the remnant of the Irish party—"*the victims of their votes,*" and his interference in consequence with the British and Irish cabinets, may be inferred from the statement made in his subsequent letter, and from the disappointment that befell those to whom he alludes. Mr. William Preston had been an early friend of Lord Charlemont, his name appears mentioned with credit in a letter of Horace Walpole's (he had written against Hutchinson's appointment to the Provostship of Trinity College). He was an ingenious, clever, and public-spirited person: he had lent his pen, both in prose and poetry, to the service of his country. The other three that the party were (as Mr. Grattan says) in "*honour bound to,*" were Curran, Fletcher, and Hardy. When these men had been proscribed by Lord Clare, as mentioned in a foregoing volume,* a document was signed by the opposition party known by the term of "*The Round Robin,*" by which it was agreed that they would not take office unless altogether. Although circumstances had altered their relationship, and the Union had changed the face of affairs, lessened their individual interest, and destroyed their weight as a party, still, in point of honor, the claims of those who remained after their struggle for the constitution of their country, were as imperative upon the leaders of the party as ever. So it appeared to Mr. Grattan; and it was this that affronted Mr. Curran, and led to the subsequent disagreement between him and Mr. Ponsonby, as he considered that Mr. Ponsonby should not have taken office till he had been provided for; the English party and the English connexion† had made him Lord

* Ante, vol. iii. p. 383. Mr. Grattan, Mr. Curran, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Ponsonby, Lord Ponsonby, and Lord Moira's names are subscribed to the document.

† His niece, daughter of W. B. Ponsonby, who was created a British peer in March, 1806, had intermarried, in 1794, with Mr. (afterwards Lord) Grey.

Chancellor, and the Irish party and the Irish connexion—Hardy and Curran—were postponed. The Irish people had too quick a discernment not to perceive this circumstance, and Mr. Grattan very properly thought himself bound to interpose; he knew better than any one how absurd was the convenient doctrine of "*measures not men*," so often practised in Ireland, and how fatally Ireland had been cheated out of her *measures* because she wanted the *men* to enforce them. But unfortunately Mr. Grattan was of all persons the worst for managing affairs of that nature; his mind could not stoop to the trickery and manœuvre of ministerial arrangements; he disliked the eternal character of an Irish petitioner, still more that of a suppliant. He forbore to make any personal request, and neglected to urge sufficiently the public claims of many faithful persons, under the apprehension that it might affect his own independence. But this was a mistaken notion on his part—fatal as well as fastidious; for he should have recollected that Ireland was his client; that at the British cabinet she had no better advocate; and that it was unjust and injurious to her friends, as well as prejudicial to the character of the Government.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

Patrick's Day, 1806.

MY DEAR BERWICK,—Dean Warburton owes his bishopric (he is to be bishop) to Lord Moira. Were I to appoint the bishop, it would be another person. Preston ought to be angry, very angry, with himself; other men are unfortunate; he, like a man starving—five long letters and a duplicate—asking and asking for what he was eminently unfit. I know not whether Plunket stays, I believe he does not; but I know Bushe does. There has been a little mystery in the management of the arrangements; I have kept clear of it. There are three persons to whom in honour we are bound; two, I am certain, are taken care

of; the third, *Hardy, I understand,* is postponed—if so, I shall state his case to such of the Cabinet as I know, strongly. It would be scandalous that Unionists should be crammed, and anti-Unionists starve. The postponement may be only for a little time—however, it should not exist. I am glad the Catholics determined against bringing forward their measures. What do you think of the bill compelling the residence of the clergy? I think there may be a great hardship in it. I find myself clear of the scrambling committee, having given in no list, and made no request.—Yours, ever,

H. G.

I hope Mrs. B. and the children are well; remember me to Lady Moira.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, 31st March, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I shall write to Ponsonby about Wallace.

I got from Mr. O'Conor an account of the Catholic proceedings; they hurt themselves by their divisions, and by the confusion of their meetings; they should have met once for all; repeated meetings can have no good effect. I got the pamphlets; one of them is the old story—Parliamentary Reform, after Parliament is abolished; the cloven foot is plain enough, the Catholics must keep clear of the United Irishmen, and the doctrine of Universal Suffrage, and Parliamentary Reform. The Catholics cannot reform the British Parliament, and have no Parliament of their own country. I am sorry M'Donnell* should be an object of jealousy, he is a worthy man, so is Byrne.* Whatever is done or said by the Catholics, great care should be taken to give the Orangemen no advantage; now faction is down, nothing but imprudence on the other side can raise it.

How is Forbes? Hardy, I believe, is secured; the applications in his favour have been decisive. Donoughmore is to be one of the postmasters. The law promotions, I suppose, are known. Is Curran in good spirits? I got a letter from Skeys,† he fears he is forgotten; he is not for-

* Both highly respected Roman Catholic merchants.

† A public spirited citizen of Dublin.

gotten, nor yet provided for, nor is there anything that I know to give him.

You saw the budget—Lord H. Petty was clear and well on the subject; the Ministry could have any loan they desired.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, April 1st, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—Send me a newspaper now and then, and let me know how the Duke of Bedford was received. The Catholics on the 12th should guard against tumult or mobbishness. I read the pamphlet, from whence I judge a paper war is commenced.* I read the other; I see the author has alluded to me; but he does not mean me ill; he wishes me well, I know it, therefore I do not wish to say anything about this pamphlet,† which might be considered as censure, nor should I have communicated a sentiment except to you confidentially; but the truth is, Drennan is not a rebel, but an enthusiast, and, on the subject of Parliamentary reform, wild and chimerical, like old Dr. Emmett. Ponsonby was drawn by the people—I am glad of it; I think he will act well. Are the Catholics registering? I hear Shaw has begun his canvass—if so, my friends will be active.

The death of the Duchess of Devonshire makes the town melancholy, that is, so much of it as has any feeling. —Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO JAMES GRATTAN.

April 7th, 1806.

MY DEAR JAMES,—Is Fanny‡ in a good state of health? Does Hanlon mean to go mad? *Anne, versus facet?* As to your horse, sell him; not a sound one—20*l.* was no price for a sound horse. Remember me to M'Can. I begin to wish myself at Tinnehinch. Tell me what is done for Curran—I hear what I did not know before, that there are difficulties. What are the politics of Dublin? The news here is bad; Prussia against us, Denmark not certain.

* Attacking the Whigs.

† On Reform, &c., by Drennan, an able writer, and very sanguine.

‡ A favourite dog.

Lord Castlereagh* called this a *bed of roses*, a very vulgar, and, in the application, a most inapplicable metaphor. His speech was not bad, it had some point and address, but no solidity. Fox was well in his answer; Henry† heard Fox, but was eating beefsteaks when he should have heard Castlereagh; I believe the debates tire him exceedingly—he will get enough of them. Mother and sisters all well. Remember me to Mr. Gannon.‡—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, April 15th, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I enclose two letters to you; I thank you for yours. You may depend on it Curran is to be taken care of; his friends here are perfectly impressed that he is to be next to Ponsonby. There never was an idea to the contrary among them; there may be delay which one is sorry for, but no one of his ministerial friends have an idea that he is to be postponed to any man except * *

Hardy is secure, his promotion has not yet taken place because some arrangement, I suppose, must precede it; it were better certainly if those things had been done at the outset, but they will be done. The Duke of Bedford, in going to Ireland, has no idea whatever, but that of doing good and serving the two countries:—his manners are reserved—his principles excellent. I think he showed good sense in his distinction between the College and the Corporation,§ than which no body can be more corrupt.

I think the Catholics are wise in their moderation; it would be a great object to their enemies to urge them to violence, in order to bring back the Government into the arms of the Old Court, which will not be the case except in consequence of intemperance on the side of the people. —Yours ever,

H. G.

* On Mr. Windham's motion regarding the military establishments, 3rd April.

† Anxious to hear Mr. Fox, I left Dublin College,—its severe studies, its hard-earned honours, and, above all, its useful, excellent, and *ever-to-be-preserved* institution (the Historical Society). Fox spoke on the Hanover treaty; his appearance is to my mind as fresh as ever; I never heard anything since comparable to him; but it was visible that his race was run—the hand of death had seized him.—(Note of Editor.)

‡ The private tutor, afterwards fellow of Dublin College.

§ In his answer to the addresses from those bodies.

Hamilton Rowan, as already stated in the fourth volume, had been sentenced in 1794 to a fine of 500*l.* and an imprisonment for two years for a libel that he neither wrote nor published. It was an address to the Volunteers, under the appellation of *Citizen Soldiers*. To avoid this unjust punishment he escaped from prison, and went to America. Mean time he was proclaimed by the Lord-Lieutenant (Westmoreland), and not appearing, was outlawed. In 1805 the outlawry was reversed, and he returned to Ireland. To him Mr. Sampson applied, in order to procure an interview with Mr. Grattan. Sampson's case was a hard one: he was a native of Derry; his profession,—the law; his religion,—the Protestant; and his politics,—those of Reform. He did not belong to the United Irishmen, nor had he ever joined their societies, but as their counsel had defended them, and being connected with the north, he had supported Lord Castlereagh's popular views and principles (then Mr. Robert Stewart, and an ardent Reformer); but when the latter changed, and when the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended and military law prevailed, Sampson was no longer safe,—he became an object of suspicion to the Government; and though no accusation was brought against him, he thought it better to go to England; but he was arrested there, and brought back (in April, 1798) to Dublin. The object, however (for that was the Government *tactique*), was *not* to bring him to trial. He demanded one; it was refused: and under terror of incarceration, without the Habeas Corpus Act to protect him, he was compelled to submit, and obliged to go into banishment. Owing to his bad state of health, he was induced to go to Portugal—was shiprecked in Wales—got to Lisbon, where he experienced the severest treatment—

was arrested and imprisoned at Oporto. At length he was sent, against his will, to France; thence he got to Hamburgh, where he remained till 1806. He had applied to Mr. Pitt's Government for leave to settle his affairs in Ireland prior to his departure for ever to America, but that was not complied with; and when the Whig party came into power, he wrote to Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Grattan, and Lord Moira, whom he had known in 1797, and to whom he had supplied some useful information relative to his motion in the House of Lords respecting Ireland. Having been included in the list of those who were banished, he had no right to return; but he got a passport from the British minister at Hamburgh, and presented himself to Lord Spencer. On this he was committed, and obliged to depart for America. In his autobiography he complains that Mr. Grattan did not reply to his application; hence it would seem that Mr. Hamilton Rowan did not communicate to him what Mr. Grattan stated. But what could Mr. Grattan do? Plead, forsooth, the cause of a banished (or self-expatriated) Irishman before a British Privy Council! before Lord Grenville! Lord Sidmouth! Lord Ellenborough! Sir William Grant! All he could have said to them, he said in the letter to Mr. Rowan, and it is to be regretted that this was not imparted to Mr. Sampson. As to the charges against that individual, the writer of this has examined every document within his reach that relates to the history of those melancholy times, and he could not discover anything against Mr. Sampson. The reign of terror, and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the horrid tyranny of the day, can alone account for the cruel treatment he received. On his arrival in America he pursued his profession, and fully succeeded; he was distinguished, liked, and re-

spected. He lived to the age of 73, and died at New York in 1836.

MR. GRATTAN TO ARCHIBALD HAMILTON ROWAN.

London, April 22nd, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—I was favoured with your note of last night, but I cannot have an interview on Mr. Sampson's* object with any person whatever.

Should his Majesty's Ministers, at any time, think proper to consult me regarding him, I shall tell them that it is a material circumstance in his case, that he has kept clear of France, and that farther, if Mr. Sampson went into rebellion, Lord Clare and his Ministry were the cause of it. —Yours, very truly,

H. GRATTAN.

Sir John Newport had been appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland,—(the office which Mr. Grattan had declined to accept); he was well qualified to discharge its duties, and he did so with zeal and honesty. He was one of the most active men in or out of Parliament; active in mind, in body, in word, and in thought. He was always on the alert; he was always at business; his pockets were bursting with Parliamentary papers and accounts; so that whether in or out of office, he was sure to be ready, and in general came well prepared on the subjects he dealt with. He was a very spirited little man, and a very useful member of Parliament; perhaps somewhat too eager and rather too much of a partizan; very fond of his country, a vigilant guardian of her interests, well acquainted with her state and her finances,—almost equal on this subject to Foster, and superior to any other man in the House of Commons.

He knew where every fact was to be found, and was indefatigable in his researches; he had papers by heart and dates at his fingers' ends, and used

* See his Autobiography. Also Mr. Madden's United Irishmen, vol. ii. second series.

to surprise and puzzle the ministers, who in general were afraid of him, got out of his way as well as they could, and nicknamed him "*The Political Ferret.*"

His speeches were said to be rather factious, and he was sometimes led into scrapes by erroneous information and want of judgment; but on the whole, he was one of the best and most useful members of the House of Commons. His weak point was enmity to Foster, and in the comparison he was always liable to the remark that Foster had opposed, and Newport supported, the Union. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, Foster showed more policy and foresight, for he delayed taxation, got loans for Ireland, and by this delay he somewhat strengthened her. Newport's financial committee laid the ground for increased taxation, which might have served the Whig administration, if they had been recalled to power, as the odium of heavy imposts would then have fallen on the Tory party; but Newport never reaped the fruits of this policy, as his friends were so long excluded. Thus his desire to obtain a triumph made him rash, and his policy proved infructuous, as Ireland could not bear additional taxes. If Newport had waited, England would have found herself less able to enforce them, as the wars in Spain and Portugal had weakened her, and Ireland would have been more able to resist. Foster's plan of loans certainly increased the debt, and accelerated the consolidation of the Exchequers, as provided for by the act of 1800. But the case of Ireland was one of difficulty and of distress, which sprung from the Union, and which in a few years settled itself, without the aid of any Chancellor of the Exchequer—Irish or English—Whig or Tory; for the weight of taxation and poverty so bore down the country, that in 1816 Ireland became insolvent, and a national bankruptcy was declared.

The statements made on the subject of the Budget will partly explain the situation of the country.

In May, 1806, the discussion on the Irish Budget came on. It is a disagreeable and an uninteresting subject, but necessary to be considered; and therefore it is not out of place to state the remarks of the Chancellor of the Irish Exchequer and of Mr. Henry Parnell on the revenues and finances of Ireland. Both agreed as to the difficulties of the country, and the embarrassments accumulated on her since the Union. The items are important, and evince a sad deterioration in the management of her affairs, from the period when, under the Irish Parliament, there was a surplus in the revenues and in the treasury. Sir John Newport stated the official value of the exports from Ireland at 5,200,000*l.*; an amount, he said, greater than at any period since 1792. The joint charge—namely, two-seventeenths of the general expenditure of the empire—was 3,788,908*l.* in Irish money; the separate charge for the interest of the debt was 2,922,346*l.*; and the entire supply 8,975,194*l.* To meet which the revenue of Ireland was only 3,800,000*l.*; and with loans of 2,166,000*l.*, treasury bills, and other articles of ways and means, amounted to 9,181,455*l.*, leaving a surplus of ways and means above the supply of 206,201*l.* This certainly was not a state of prosperity, but a progress of debt and an approach to ruin.

He proposed new taxes,—3*s.* 6*d.* per cwt. augmentation duty on sugar; 20 per cent. on tea (under 2*s.* 6*d.* a pound); 2*s.* per cwt. on iron. He proposed to repeal the existing stamp duties, and modify them by a new bill. As to the distilleries, he proposed to take away duties on stills of certain dimensions. The export of linen from

Ireland he stated to be 5,500,000 yards. This picture of the finances of Ireland was not flattering; but when Mr. Parnell came to analyse them he represented it in colours less pleasing by far. He stated that in 1792 the expenditure of Ireland was only 1,735,000*l.*; in 1805 it was 8,713,000*l.*: in 1792 the debt of Ireland was 2,422,000*l.*; in 1805 it was 58,344,000*l.*: that in 1792 the revenue of Ireland was 1,103,000*l.*; and in 1805 it was 3,364,000*l.*

The disparity between the revenue and the expenditure of Ireland was alarming. Ireland was expending at the rate of nine millions a year, with a revenue of only three millions; the whole of which was mortgaged to pay the interest of the debt. But what was still more alarming was, that in 1803 new taxes had been imposed that were calculated to produce 380,000*l.*; in 1804 more new taxes had been imposed, calculated also to produce 1,253,000*l.*; and more taxes in 1805, to produce 255,000*l.* Thus since 1802 taxes had been imposed to the amount of 1,888,000*l.*; and yet the revenue had only increased 50,000*l.*! With regard to the exports of Ireland, the official value of exports and imports in 1783 was 5,000,000*l.*, and in 1802 was 11,000,000*l.*; the real value was 18,000,000*l.*; of which the imports were 8,000,000*l.*; leaving a balance of trade in favour of Ireland amounting to 2,000,000*l.*

With regard to the debt — If Ireland went on for the next fifteen years (when, by the Act of Union, she would be liable to pay equal taxes with England), her debt would be in the next five years 90,000,000*l.*, in ten years would be 120,000,000*l.*, and in fifteen years would be 150,000,000*l.*; the interest of which the people

of Ireland would be unable to pay. This prediction was more than verified, as in ten years Ireland became bankrupt, and could pay neither taxes nor debt—principal or interest!

Mr. Foster observed that the debt of Ireland in 1797 was but 7,000,000*l.*; and if it went on increasing as it had done, would in 1807 amount to 64,000,000*l.*

To such a state of embarrassment had the Union and *the measures preparatory thereto* reduced the people of Ireland! How different from what was promised by Mr. Pitt and Lord Castlereagh when they proposed it!

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, May 8th, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I trouble you to send the enclosed to Hartley—written according to your desire. I had a letter from Curran—he will be satisfied, I hope; I saw Mr. FOX about his subject; he may be sure that he has not been deserted by me, nor, I think, by Mr. FOX.

The Irish Budget was opened last night. I thought it necessary to say a few words to correct an idea that the country was extremely rich, and that more new taxes were eligible. The speech is not taken in the English papers; I will send it to you by the evening post. I shall be soon in Ireland, viz. about the end of the month; consult James about it. —Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, June 5th, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I thank you for your letter and for the papers. I hope to see you soon. The Irish business has almost gone through the House; there was no occasion to speak on it, as there was no opposition to it. The business of our friends is not yet settled. Is Fletcher to be the judge? Curran, I suppose, by this time is the Rolls? Is Hardy a Commissioner? Write to me on these subjects. Egan is here—I wish him well; but Fletcher is the old veteran who has a prior claim, and ought to be the judge. Does Ponsonby satisfy? Are his

old friends pleased with him? His brother is ill—I fear for his life.*

I shall stay here a fortnight longer. The Ministry are strong; on the late divisions the Opposition received a signal overthrow; we had two long debates;† sat up all night the first, and a great part of the second. I spoke the second, but not the speech in the papers. I depend on you for the news of Dublin.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, June 17th, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I got your letter of the 11th of June. I thought to have seen you before this, but have been detained in London by an operation, from which I am now recovered, but am not at liberty to set out for home for nine days to come; it has confined me from Parliament, and will do so for a week. The *Courier* and *Star* mis-stated me, I said the member had not given an example of good Irish oratory,‡ or good Irish understanding.

Ryan is quite in an error,§ I never interfered for him or against him, nor ever recommended or disrecommended Rawlings, nor took any part on similar subjects, and, therefore, Rawlings and Ryan have no occasion to thank me, or not to thank me; mention this to Ryan when you see him.

I am sorry to hear such an account from Ireland regarding bankruptcies; a bill will be brought into Parliament on the subject. The Corn Bill‖ is a good measure. We understand Curran is to be the Rolls, Hardy a Commissioner.—Yours, most truly,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, June 30th, 1806.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I shall see you in a very few days;

* He died shortly after.

† On the Limited Service Bill.

‡ On Mr. Windham's Training Bill—General Stewart had alluded to Mr. Grattan calling him *the Irish orator*.

§ The person who had written to Mr. Fox.

‖ Sir John Newport's bill "to make the intercourse in grain between Great Britain and *Ireland free and unrestrained*,"—a most useful measure, which served England, increased the exports of Ireland, and assisted her agriculture.

I am quite recovered; I long to get to Ireland. The account you give me of our friend Hardy gives me much satisfaction. Curran's business is long in settling—I hope it will be properly and satisfactorily concluded; it is not for want of time; I have not been at home when his son called—I hope to see him to-day. If Fletcher be the Judge he will be a good one—his manners are rough, but his heart and judgment excellent. They talk of peace.

I am sorry that there should be bankruptcies in Ireland and of such extensive mischief—but I am not surprised* when dirty paper is made money—such money will at last turn out to be dirty paper; some measure will be taken, but it is late, not I hope too late. I enclose a letter to our friend, not recollecting his address—remember me to him.—Yours ever,

H. G.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. M'Can.

Stradbally, July 24th, 1806.

My dear M'Can,—I got the evening paper. The contest about Curran is a foolish one; the opponents disclaim any personal objection, and by voting addresses† to different Chancellors, they have disclaimed any objections to the principle. What then do they object to, if neither to the man nor to the principle?

I have not heard anything about Fox since the 14th of this month. I received two letters of that date, from his house, mentioning that he was much better, that his looks had much improved, and that his friends justly hoped he

* Millers and shopkeepers became bankers and issued notes, and did much injury to the country.

† A difference of opinion had at first arisen among the bar as to the propriety of presenting an address to Mr. Curran on his appointment to the Rolls. A meeting, however, was convened, and an address voted to him; his reply will be found in the second volume of his life, p. 164. It was a matter of regret that the high tone and public spirit of that body had been much impaired by the conduct of Lord Chancellor Clare and by the numerous offices and places that his government had created and carved out for its members. The principles too, which he instilled into them were unfortunately continued for a long time by Lord Manners, who gave not merely a *high Tory tinge*, but a character of prejudice and religious bigotry to all his proceedings and connexions with that body, and thus completed the original injury done to its reputation and its independence.

would be restored to a state of tolerable health—those were the words.—Yours ever,

H. G.

I hope you have no hay, otherwise you will be an unhappy man. I wish, instead of meadows, I had a good *sea farm* at Tinnehinch, such as you have at Sandymount.*

The Duke of Bedford's letter will be read with interest, and his remarks on Mr. Fox will be justly appreciated. 'T is true he was a loss to Ireland; the greatest she could then sustain,—almost the only friend she had in England, and one who would have been more efficient and more serviceable if he had possessed more power and enjoyed better health; but he could not serve her,—he had France to deal with, and the negotiations then pending occupied his entire thoughts. The question was not between Ireland and England, but between England and France. Mr. Fox came too late to the assistance of Ireland; the King had rendered her case almost hopeless, and had made up his mind against applying the proper, if not the only remedy. It was fortunate that George III. governed an island: had she been part of the continent, neither he, nor his system, nor his kingdom would have lasted for an hour. It was also fortunate that neither steam nor railways were then known; those powerful engines might have destroyed the bulwarks of a despotic government; they may yet prove the best securities for Irish freedom.

THE LORD LIEUTENANT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Dublin Castle, September 30th, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—I beg leave to acquaint you, that avail-

* A suburb of Dublin on the coast, where Mr. M'Can had a place that was washed by the waves.

ing myself of your obliging acquiescence in the request I ventured to make, that you would lend your assistance to the Commission to be appointed, under the authority of the Act, of the last Session of Parliament, to inquire into the state and conditions of the schools, &c. I have named you one of the Commissioners under that Act, and I am persuaded that you will cheerfully give your powerful aid to an object of so much interest. It is, however, not only in this, but in matters of far greater moment, that I look with hope and confidence to your advice and assistance, in the severe and irreparable loss we have sustained, by the death* of that great, and good, and virtuous man, whom it has pleased Providence to take from us, and in a crisis of almost unexampled difficulty. Ireland has perhaps suffered more than any part of the empire, or of Europe; the people of Ireland looked up to Mr. Fox with an unlimited confidence; they knew his incorruptible integrity, his warm attachment to the dearest interests of Ireland, and they felt sure, that whilst power was in the hands of Mr. Fox, those interests would not be neglected or forsaken; such, if I am not mistaken, were the feelings of the people of this country. The confidence they reposed in the Government of the country must, I fear, be much diminished by the death of him, whom they considered as their friend and protector. They can know but little of me; yet, as I came here at his anxious and earnest solicitation, as the organ of his voice and of his wishes; I feel it to be a duty I have to discharge to his memory, to seek the support and co-operation of those, who are animated by the same feelings, the same principles, the same love of truth and freedom, the same abhorrence of treachery and oppression, and the same unequivocal regard for the interest and happiness of Ireland, which were inseparable from his character and conduct. Among them Mr. Grattan unquestionably stands the foremost. I have therefore to entreat, that as long as my administration in this country may last, that I may be favoured with your confidential opinions and advice in all matters connected with the welfare of this part of the empire. On this foundation I shall rest my best hopes of effecting any portion of that good, to this hitherto ill-used and neglected country, which, unmixed with ambition of any other nature, formed my sole inducement to accept the

* He died of a dropsical complaint on the 13th of September, at the age of fifty-nine.

situation I now hold.—I have the honour to be, with the most perfect esteem and regard, your very faithful and obedient servant,

BEDFORD.

SIR JOHN NEWPORT TO MR. GRATTAN.

New Park, 16th October, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—Will you excuse me for trespassing upon your time by requesting you will favour me with a line, to say whether the Committee of Inquiry into the State of Schools, in which you have kindly allowed yourself to be numbered, has yet commenced its operations? I am anxious to learn, as it is in my mind a leading object, and there are amongst those to whom the inquiry is entrusted, some to whom I look, from experience, with much and sanguine confidence. I need not say to which of the branches composing the commission I allude in this remark. I have just returned home from a visit to Cork, where I have been so feasted and so complimented, as to awaken every spark of vanity in my bosom; my countrymen are indeed a generous and confiding people; perhaps overmuch—they do not deserve to be treated as they too often are.

You are, my dear sir, fully aware of the very trying and critical situation in which I am placed; and indeed how fearfully we are all committed with the people, to whom we stand pledged against a continuance of those abuses which have pulled down ruin on our country and merited odium on our predecessors. The revenues collected with such difficulty, and by so many burthensome means, can no longer be diverted from the Exchequer into the pockets of individuals,* or we could never stand excused who have reprobated during many years such a system of peculation. I expect to be in Dublin at farthest by the first week of November, perhaps before it, when perhaps we may meet, which will always afford much pleasure to,—My dear Sir, yours most truly,

JOHN NEWPORT.

* This referred to some defaulter who wished intercession to be made for him with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, encouraged no doubt by the precedent set by the Government in the case of Sir William Newcomen, who was forgiven a large portion of his defalcation at the period of the Union: the system of corruption then laid down it was hoped might be prolonged, if not perpetuated. In fact, the Union destroyed the morality as well as the liberty of the people. See ante, page 175.

As reference has been made to the very important subject of education, it appears better to transpose to this place a letter of Mr. Grattan's, though written some years later. He was always a strong advocate for the education of the people.

MR. GRATTAN TO THE SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Welbeck Street, 25th March, 1811.

SIR,—I had the honour to receive your letter, written by the commands of the Board of Education, expressing their desire that the absent members of that body should communicate by letter their plans on the subject of the education of the poorer orders of the people of Ireland. In obedience to the wishes of the board, I venture to submit, what I do not presume to call a plan, but instead of one, a few ideas founded on that plan which the Legislature has already recommended.

I would pursue the suggestion of the act that established parish-schools, with such alterations as must arise from the change of time, circumstances, and condition. According to that act, I would recommend parish-schools as bringing education to every man's door; but parish-schools better endowed than the present, and on a more extensive, and by far a more comprehensive foundation.

And I would submit, as a proper subject-matter of education in those schools, not only the study of the English tongue, reading, writing, and arithmetic, but also the study of certain books of horticulture and agriculture, together with treatises on the care and knowledge of trees.

I would recommend that such studies should be pursued in the English schools already established.

I should recommend that in those parish-schools the christian religion should be taught; but that no particular description of it should form a part of their education—in the place thereof, it might perhaps not be improper to devise some general instructions regarding the four great duties of man,—duty to God, duty to one another, duty to the country, and duty to the government.

I beg to add, that one great object of national education should be to unite the inhabitants of the island, and that such an event cannot be well accomplished, except they are taught to speak one common language. I think the

diversity of language, and not the diversity of religion, constitutes a diversity of people. I should be very sorry that the Irish language should be forgotten; but glad that the English language should be generally understood; to obtain that end in Ireland, it is necessary that the schools formed on a plan of national education, which teach the English language, should not attempt to teach the English religion, because the Catholics who would resort to our schools to learn, will keep aloof if we attempt to make them proselytes to the other; and we should, by that attempt, reject one great means of uniting our people; and we shall continue to add to the imaginary *political* division, supposed to exist in a difference of religion, a real *political* division formed on the diversity of language.—I have the honour to be, your most faithful servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

Lord Fitzwilliam's kindness was never wanting. There is undoubtedly in the English character this most valuable and estimable quality,—*once a friend, always a friend!* a noble and a national sentiment, too much confined to Great Britain. Politics, perhaps, are the only ingredients that are there permitted to embitter social intercourse. In some instances this has been too much the case; and it is to be regretted that they are allowed to bear such sway in domestic life. Fortunately, however, they are freed from the asperity and uncourtliness with which religious differences in Ireland have tainted the sweets of private and domestic happiness.

LORD FITZWILLIAM TO MR. GRATTAN.

Most secret and confidential.

London, 13th October, 1806.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—Dissolution of Parliament is fixed; and will take place in less than a fortnight. Let me know if you will permit us to re-elect you at Malton. Pray direct to me at Wentworth, near Rotherham.—Ever yours,

WENTWORTH FITZWILLIAM.

Right Hon. H. Grattan.

The offer from Lord Fitzwilliam was not accepted. Mr. Grattan's friends had called on him to stand for his native city, and he was accordingly put in nomination. He met with considerable opposition from the Orange and anti-Catholic party that continued to influence several of the Dublin corporations; notwithstanding which, he was elected, along with Mr. Robert Shaw; but Mr. La Touche, the other popular candidate, and who stood on the same interest as Mr. Grattan, was defeated.

On the 7th of November, the Guild of Merchants having assembled to consider the merits of the respective candidates, Mr. Grattan attended their hall. An interval of ten years had passed since he had addressed his fellow-citizens, in a celebrated and remarkable letter, in which he bade them farewell. His predictions had unfortunately been verified,—an insurrection had been created, and the Parliament had been destroyed; and it might have been thought that time sufficient had elapsed to permit political animosities to expire also.

Guild of Merchants.

Gentlemen,—In addressing this assembly, the representative of the mercantile interest of this city, and as such possessing, no doubt, much of that public and free spirit which belongs to trade, I feel much confidence—a confidence founded upon the consciousness that, in the course of not a short political life, I have laboured, probably not altogether without success, to promote both your trade and your liberty. With the history of those public labours, my fellow-citizens cannot be unacquainted. At a very early period, so early as the year 1778, I proposed an address to Parliament for the freedom of your trade. In 1779, I contributed, and successfully, to carry the principle of that address into effect. In 1780, I moved a resolution in Parliament to assert the independency of the Irish legislature. In the year '81 I repeated that motion; in

the year '82 I *carried* it, and the *Parliament of Ireland became Free.* I afterwards continued these efforts, and proposed and carried various other measures for the better securing of that trade and that liberty, which the spirit of my country has assisted me to obtain. In '85 your trade was attacked by the propositions; I opposed them, and exerted myself to defeat that attempt, as I have always opposed every attempt to take away, by influence, what has been obtained by integrity. In the years which followed, my labours were directed to the same objects. I opposed every measure tending to promote the influence of the crown at the expense of the constitution; and most particularly did I apply myself to resist every measure which trenched upon the privileges and interests of the City of Dublin. In doing this, I did not apply myself to the passions or to the prejudices of my fellow-citizens; I consulted their interest only; I did not cultivate the narrow spirit of party. I did not apply myself to the *little* motives which may have sometimes influenced some of my countrymen; I applied myself only to those *great principles* by which alone liberty can be acquired or preserved; by which alone nations can be rendered prosperous, and great communities kept together. Without regard to the prejudices of the people, or to the influence of the crown, I combated the abuses which prevailed in the different branches of the State and of the Constitution. The consequence was, what I could not but have foreseen, I made myself many enemies among those to whom such abuses were beneficial. I was assailed at different times by the persecution of the Minister, and by the violence of the people. I remained *unsubdued* by *either.* When the *Constitution of Parliament* was endangered, I forgot the past, I remembered nothing of my countrymen, but that they were fellow-citizens. I came back into public life to defend the Constitution we had obtained; I came back oppressed by infirmity, and had to combat at once the power of the court and the vehemence of the people. I engaged in the defence of that Constitution, without any feeling of resentment for the obloquy or for the persecution I had suffered. I came without any feeling but for the interest of my fellow-citizens, accompanied by a determination to defend it. After those services, if the situation of our country did not call for further exertions, I might have retired without dishonour; and now, if my only

object were to be in Parliament, I may come into it for a seat in another country, without trouble and without expense. I prefer to this, the trouble, the fatigue, the anxiety of a popular election. Why do I prefer it? Because I think it would be but little honourable to this city, to my country, that the man who has faithfully and laboriously served her for thirty years, should be obliged to sit in Parliament for a borough in another country, in order to serve his own, because it would appear a circumstance of whimsical incongruity, if I, who had opposed and defeated the claims of England to legislate for Ireland, should be returned to Parliament by England, whose claims I had opposed, after rejection by that country whose legislative independence I had defended. But I am charged with having the support of Government. As to any undue exertion of the influence of the Government in my favour, I call on you to judge of the truth or falsehood of that charge, by the character and conduct of those who support me, and of myself. Who are they that support me? Are they not men who have ever opposed Government, when Government aimed at the independence and privileges of the people. Are they not men who have always supported the freedom and independence of election against the power and influence of the crown? Men incapable of being commanded by any Government to do what was not consistent with the purest spirit of public virtue. To suppose that such men would betray their fame, and abuse the confidence of the public, to reduce this city to a borough, is a supposition contrary to common sense; nor is it less so to suppose that this loyal city should capriciously and senselessly oppose a candidate, if otherwise unexceptionable, merely because that candidate was not opposed by the Government.

As to myself, what has there been in my public life that can give colour to such a charge? Why should I resort to unconstitutional influence to support me? I offer myself to your city with no view to title, with no view to wealth, with no view to power. For what purpose, then, can I offer myself, but that of rendering, and continuing to render, service to the public. Shall I, who have, during thirty years, contended against the Crown *for* the people, now solicit the Crown to reduce this city to a borough, that I may represent it? Gentlemen, I might on such an occasion humble myself before you by professions, and by

promises, and by entering into a detailed refutation of such charges, but I abstain, because I think I pay greater respect to your understandings, by referring to it for the answer of such senseless accusation, confident that you will listen to truth as spoken to you by *facts* within your knowledge.

With such pretensions, Gentlemen, I offer myself to you to represent this city in Parliament. In my canvass I have found a cordial reception, not merely such as belongs to an honest mind, but such as characterises a free people. Should this city return me to Parliament, I shall discharge my duty to them on the same principles I have hitherto done. Should this corporation concur with their fellow-citizens, I shall consider it an additional circumstance of gratification; should both reject me, should the city of Dublin refuse to elect me, I shall lament the inconstancy of the city, but I shall not desert their interests.

MR. JOHN KEOGH TO MR. GRATTAN.

Mount Jerome, 8th November, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—I thank you for your kind note. I never regretted so much as at present my want of health, as it has prevented me from personally canvassing on this occasion. Whatever has occurred to my friends and to myself has been and will be done. We must have been lost to public and private virtue if we had deserted you. Your posterity will have a claim on ours, and your sons will, I trust, experience their gratitude. As to yourself, your cause and that of Ireland are one. I need not say how happy I shall be to see you as you propose. Yet I cannot consent to the wasting one moment here of your time, which is now peculiarly precious.

But if you will do me that honour after your election, I shall be more gratified than by seeing any other man in the empire.—I remain, most respectfully and sincerely, your faithful friend,

JOHN KEOGH.*

THE LORD LIEUTENANT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Phœnix Park, November 9th, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—I congratulate you on the termination of your labours and fatigue, as well as that they have ter-

* One of the ablest of the Catholic body, see ante, vol. iv. page 82.

minated as they ought, by placing you at the head of the poll. A government, the leading object of whose solicitude is the welfare of Ireland, cannot but feel a just pride in being honoured by the support of Mr. Grattan; and the opinions of the citizens of Dublin, having thus shown themselves to be in unison with those of the Government, I must look upon as a favourable era in my administration, and I willingly flatter myself that it may be considered as auspicious to the future prosperity of the empire.—I have the honour to be, with the most perfect esteem and regard, my dear Sir, your very faithful and obedient servant,

BEDFORD.

There has been always a noble spirit in the character and composition of Irish women, as well as a sterling principle of virtue, both of which it would be well for their countrymen to imitate.

Limerick tells of their boldness, and even their courage; the old Countess of Desmond of their high bearing and intrepid dignity; and here we have an instance of the independence of mind that influenced the descendant of that venerable lady. The feeling which prompted Mrs. Grattan at the time of the insurrection and the Union seemed to direct her on the present occasion; and as at the one period she would not tolerate the idea that her country should be debased, so at the other she would not permit that her husband should be dependent.

The Catholics, in the most honourable manner, subscribed 4,000*l.* to defray the expenses of the election, but Mr. Grattan would not accept it.

MRS. GRATTAN TO JAMES HARTLEY, ESQ.

7th December, 1806.

MY DEAR SIR,—Your letter was received, as I expressed myself in a hurried note yesterday, with much thanks. Our triumph being so complete, is an honour to his friends, that most respectable body of citizens, and our obligation to them is great, but though it does not lessen the obligation, we must not receive any pecuniary assistance.

This letter is written to you in consequence of Mr. Grattan's and my decided determination. Do not attempt to make him alter it. You know he is not to be shaken when he feels himself to be in the right. You also will join us when it is to gratify me. I did not propose, at an earlier period, that he should pay the expenses, because I wished the world to see there were so many noble-minded men who would assist him in every acceptation of the word. It is to you I must apologise, as you will now have more trouble in the business. You must borrow the money and repay those who have subscribed—it may be difficult but you can overcome it—and be assured it will add to the obligations I am under to you.—Very truly yours,

HENRIETTA GRATTAN.

LORD FITZWILLIAM TO MR. GRATTAN.

Milton, December 28th, 1806.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—A few days after the receipt of your letter, I wrote to the Duke of Bedford upon the subject of M'Can,* but though your letter brought to my memory some imperfect recollection, that friendly intentions were entertained towards M'Can, during my administration, still, none of the particulars of his merits or claims occurring, I felt myself under the necessity of referring the Duke to you and to the Chancellor, for the grounds of his pretensions to favour. If you have not already been called upon on that subject, you may expect it. I assure you I took part in your triumph at Dublin, and felt relieved from great anxiety when I saw it complete.

Though the exertions of the regular civil authority seem to have produced excellent effect in Ireland, still it is a subject of much lamentation, if not of serious† remorse,

* Directly or indirectly no one connected with Mr. Grattan ever received any situation from any government; in this case, Mr. M'Can had public claims, he had been secretary to the Whig Club, a spirited and active supporter, he had been instrumental in getting the speeches of the opposition members published—particularly those that were preserved at the period of the Union. He never was promoted to any place, and he used often to say to Mr. Grattan, "You are an excellent patriot, but a very bad patron."

† This has reference to the proceedings in the counties of Sligo, Mayo, Leitrim, Longford, and Cavan, by bodies of men called Threshers, who resisted the payments to the Established Church, and fees and dues to the Catholic clergy, they attacked and injured individuals who refused to obey their orders and regulations. A special commission was sent to

that there should be occasion for any exertions whatever. All that one has to observe is, that there is no good without its evil. I hope we shall see you soon. The ample display of all the minutes of negotiation, which Buonaparte has himself thought proper to make, and to put us under the necessity of making, will, I trust, prove not unserviceable, as it brings to light, distinct intentions, by undisguised professions ;* intentions, indeed, that the parties concerned ought to have discovered in the principles of his conduct, but to which they have hitherto thought proper to shut their eyes; the light, however, now bursts in upon them with a glare not to be avoided; they must see whether they will or no.

Make my best respects to Mrs. G.—Ever truly yours,

WENTWORTH FITZWILLIAM.

Rt. Hon. H. Grattan.

these counties in the month of December, at which several convictions took place, and by degrees the disturbances subsided. Disturbances such as these have been for too long a time the disgrace of the country; they sprung from the oppressive system of tithes, the evils of which the Governments of Ireland neglected to remedy.

* The dispatches and correspondence of Mr. Fox, Talleyrand, and the French Government, from which the ambitious designs of the Emperor were but too clearly visible.

CHAPTER X.

The Duke of Bedford's letter on a provision for the Catholic clergy.—Mr. Grattan's opinion thereon.—Also Edmund Burke's.—Proceedings of the Catholics as to their petition in 1807.—Mr. Ponsonby's opinion and letter thereon.—Meeting of the new Parliament.—Lord Grenville and Lord Howick continued in the ministry.—Remarks on their character.—The Catholic Military Bill at first approved of, then objected to, by the King.—The bill abandoned.—Unconstitutional pledge demanded by the King.—Refused.—They are dismissed.—Mr. Grattan's letter to the Duke of Bedford on the subject.—His letter to Lord Fingall on the Catholic petition.—Speech of Mr. Keogh.—Resolution in favour of the Duke of Bedford.—His reply.—Mr. Preston's death.—Mr. Hardy his successor.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Mr. Berwick.—No-Popery administration.—Their conduct.—Their character.—Mr. Canning.—Mr. Perceval.—House of Commons desert the Whigs, and support Mr. Perceval's party.—Parliament dissolved.—Unconstitutional efforts of the Tories at the elections.—Great majority in their favour in the House of Commons.—Insurrection and Arms bill.—Mr. Grattan's conduct.—Mr. Sheridan's motion on the state of Ireland.—Speech of Mr. Grattan thereon.—His letters on the subject.—To Mr. Berwick and Mr. M'Can, and to H. Grattan, jun.

THE following letter will be read with interest by all who set a value on private friendship and public virtue. Hardy trembled not only for his fate, but for that of the country, and he knew full well that Mr. Fox was the last hope that Ireland had. The appeal to Mr. Grattan was a feeling one, and the opinion as to the Castle of Dublin was perfectly just. That never was a place where Irish patriotism was rewarded.

MR. HARDY TO MR. GRATTAN.

January 5th, 1807.

As I shall not be so fortunate as to see you again till next summer, when, please God, we may meet, I can

only say, and do say it from my heart, that, next to the inhabitants of Tinnehinch, there does not exist that person on this earth, who is more truly and more disinterestedly attached to you than myself. Let the tide of emolument run in what current it may, never—never till my last hour shall I forget the man at whose house, and in whose family, I passed so many, so happy days. You will oblige me beyond measure if you will let me know by one line from Bath, or London, how dear Mrs. Grattan does, for, indeed, I am, and ever must be, anxious about her.

Adieu—my heart is heavy at parting from you all. As to *situation*, I can only say, that if *you* state my claims to the Duke, as you, and only you can, I shall look on myself as secure; if you do not, God's will be done, for I am sure *nothing* will be done *at* the Castle.—Ever, with the truest affection, yours,

FRANCIS HARDY.

THE LORD LIEUTENANT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Phœnix Park, January 9th, 1807.

DEAR SIR,—When you were good enough to call upon me at the Castle, on the day previous to your sailing for England, it entirely escaped me, in the course of our conversation, to name to you one very material point of the future policy to be pursued in regard to Ireland, upon which I wish much to have the advantage of your opinion and advice. It relates to the propriety, efficacy, and wisdom of the Government of the country, making a provision for the Roman Catholic clergy. This is a measure that has frequently been discussed, I believe, by former administrations, sometimes thought right, but neglected to be carried into effect through a timid or temporizing policy, which, unhappily for Ireland, has too often prevailed among my predecessors, and palsied all those efforts which, under a temper of combined prudence and vigour, firmness and decision, might have made this country very different from what she is.

I am aware that there are objections to this measure, and that we should not fail to meet with much opposition in the progress of it, but this alone should not deter us from attempting it, if a great practical benefit is likely to be the result of such a measure. Some who are friendly to it, think that this is not a favourable moment to bring it

forward, but I confess this objection does not strike me. I know the time was, when the Catholic bishops and priests would not have accepted the boon, if offered, from an apprehension that it might weaken their influence with their flocks, and that the laity might look upon them with suspicion. * * * * * * *

The remainder of this letter was unfortunately lost, and the answer cannot be procured. It is a circumstance the more to be regretted, as, at the present moment, the subject alluded to is under the consideration of both countries. After a lapse of forty years, the expediency of buying up the Catholics of Ireland, by bribing their clergy, is the political process put in agitation—the last resource of Government on the failure of the Union, and the forlorn hope of the British minister. The question is now pending in the national balance, and the only countervailing weights to it, seem, at present, to be the poverty of Ireland and the bigotry of Great Britain.

The opinion of Mr. Grattan, therefore, may be of service, and it is important to know, that he was decidedly averse to such a proposition—(his sentiments on the subject of the veto, which was brought forward in the ensuing year, will appear in the Eleventh Chapter). He always thought it would be dangerous to give the Crown power over the Catholic church; that it would be used as in the Protestant church, and liberty would be the victim; he said that he doubted if emancipation had been granted on such conditions, whether the benefit resulting from the admission of the Catholics, would be equal to the injury likely to arise from granting so much power to the Crown, and he was almost of opinion that the evil would be greater than the benefit. He observed, that if the Catholic clergy were paid by the Government, their influence over the people would be preju-

dicial. At the period of the Union, the plan proposed was, to give salaries *not attached to the See*, but at the will of the Government, so that the salary could be withdrawn if the clergy displeased, or did not court the minister. It was by means such as these that the Presbyterian clergy were silenced—they were bribed by the *Regium Donum*—Government divided them into classes, and the salaries of the several classes were then raised, lest they should become troublesome, and ever since that event they have been quiet. This was a measure of Lord Castlereagh; the measure was one of bribery, and Mr. Wickham, who was secretary, told Mr. Grattan that the plan had been adopted in order to prevent any danger to the Protestant church establishment.

Such were Mr. Grattan's sentiments, and they have been confirmed by great authority. Edmund Burke, in his Correspondence, published in 1844, by Lord Fitzwilliam and General Sir R. Bourke, writes on the subject of Maynooth College to Dr. Hussey, in 1795, and there expresses, in the strongest terms, his objection to the interference of Government with the Catholic clergy. His remarks are subjoined.*

* "All other interference (except that of laying the accounts before Parliament) whatever, if I were in the place of these reverend persons, I would resist; and would much rather trust to God's good providence, and the contributions of your own people, for the education of your clergy, than to put into the hands of your known, avowed, and implacable enemies—into the hands of those who make it their merit and their boast, that they are your enemies—the very fountains of your morals and your religion. I have considered this matter at large, and at various times, and I have considered it in relation to the designs of your enemies. The scheme of these colleges, as you well know, did not originate from them. But they will endeavour to pervert the benevolence and liberality of others into an instrument of their own evil purposes. Be well assured, that they never did, and that they never will, consent to give one shilling of money for any other purpose than to do you mischief. If you consent to put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end, not only of

The Catholics had held several meetings on the subject of their claims, and had appointed committees and sub-committees for the purpose of forwarding them. Sensible of the loss they had sustained by the death of Mr. Fox, but unacquainted with the other members of the Whig interest in England, and ignorant of the state of affairs and parties, they did not look with implicit confidence to the British Government; they did not comprehend the policy of petitioning at one moment and not petitioning at another, neither did they understand the nice distinctions or the prudent delicacy which would lead them to consult the prejudices of their *masters*—those who were to be the *Donors* of their *Rights*. They had not for-

the Catholic religion, but of all religion, all morality, all law, and all order, in that unhappy kingdom."—Vol. iv. p. 298.

"I strongly suspect that an insidious court will be paid to your clergy; what friends would bestow as gifts, enemies will give as bribes. There has been for certain, amongst your Irish politicians, a scheme (amongst other schemes for the distraction and ruin of the kingdom) for dividing the clergy from the laity, and the lower classes of Catholic laity from the higher. I know that they already value themselves on their success in this wicked and senseless project, and they hope that the Catholic clergy will be brought, by management, to act their part in this design against the people, of consideration and property amongst them. I have no doubt that the sagacity and vigilance of the Catholic clergy will soon convince them of their mistake; and that they are never to be seduced into a separation from the higher orders, or intimidated into a dereliction of the lower orders, but that they will take one common fate, and sink or swim with their brethren of every description."—Vol. iv. p. 302.

"I am sure that the constant meddling of the bishops and the clergy with the Castle, and of the Castle with them, will infallibly set them ill with their own body. All the weight which hitherto the clergy have had in keeping the people quiet, will be wholly lost if once this should happen; at best, you will soon have a marked schism, and more than one kind; and I am very much mistaken if this very thing is not intended, and diligently and systematically pursued. I am steadily of my old opinion, that this affair had better be wholly dropped, and this government boon, with civility and acknowledgment declined, than to subject yourselves and your religion to your known and avowed enemies, who connect their very interest with your humiliation, and found their own reputation on the destruction of yours. I have said so much on this point already, that I shall trouble you no more about it."—Vol. iv. p. 322.

gotten the advice of Lord Grenville, to petition session after session till their prayers should be granted.

Accordingly, on the 24th of February, they resolved that Lord Fingall should request Mr. Grattan to present their petition to Parliament. Mr. Grattan had, however, anticipated this communication, and, on the 21st, had given his opinion to the Catholic party. He had no doubt calculated all the chances, and having made up his mind, was not to be moved from his resolve. He saw that the Parliament was new, and its sentiments unknown; if, then, the petition had been merely laid on the table, and no further motion made, that would have been a sign of weakness; if it had been well received by the Commons, and a bill brought in, the Lords were at hand, under the guidance of the Duke of York, the Duke of Cumberland, Lord Sidmouth and *his friend*—the King—to discomfit and dismiss at once both the measure and the ministry. Ireland would then have been considered as the cause of their overthrow; the charge of turning out the Whigs would have been brought against her throughout England, and she would thereby have lost many friends, and made many enemies. To avoid this, and to save Ireland from the catastrophe and the accusation, was Mr. Grattan's policy; it was a judicious one, and, as events turned out, was a strong demonstration of his sagacity and foresight, and showed that he knew how to conduct a policy, and also how to protect a party. Scarcely had a feeble and secondary attempt in favour of religious toleration been pressed upon the King by the successor of Mr. Fox, when his Majesty *ran rebel* to his people, pleaded his oath in bar, raised his standard against them, and, in the person of Mr. Perceval, found a second Clare, with all his bigotry,

and with more than his religion; prostrated the RECUSANT* Whigs, and scattered them, their party and their principles, to the winds.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, February 21st, 1807.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I just received your letter. I will not make the motion for the consideration of the Catholic petition, because it is against my opinion, so they had better apply to some other person, as my refusal, which I must give to the application, would perhaps offend the Catholics. I never will make a motion of which I disapprove. I respect and love the Catholics, and it is on their account I shall not be instrumental to a business which may do them an injury. If their question does come on, I will support it, but I will not be an instrument to bring it on. I wish you could prevent their application: talk to Wallace.—Yours ever,

H. G.

Mr. Ponsonby's opinions as to the policy of declining to urge the claims of the Catholics upon Parliament, coincided with those of Mr. Grattan, which had been conveyed to his friends in Ireland in the preceding letter. So far, their sentiments were in unison. Another subject, however, was brought forward in this letter, namely, the reference to those whom Mr. Ponsonby calls "*Separatists and allies of France.*" Here it is to be supposed that the information of the Chancellor must have been accurate, upon which to found so grave a suspicion, and to venture so serious a charge. The view he took thereon was not for any party purposes, he stated his deliberate opinion, formed, no doubt, upon the best information, and conveyed it to one who had at heart, not only the enfranchisement of the Catholics, but the security of the Empire. Upon this Mr. Grat-

* Highly to their credit they refused to give a pledge not to urge the King further on the Catholic question.

tan acted, and he gave his support shortly after to two bills, prepared by the Attorney and Solicitor-General (the Arms and Insurrection Acts), which had been passed by the Irish Parliament in 1796 and 97, and had now been *reframed* with Mr. Elliot's and Mr. Ponsonby's knowledge, but which raised so great a storm against him, that it required all his coolness and independent spirit to encounter it. The statement that Mr. Ponsonby and Mr. Grattan made was not new, for there always has been an anti-English party in Ireland; and for this reason, because the laws have always been *anti-Irish*, and so long as such laws continue, whether in spirit or in principle, so long, and long after (for effects continue beyond their causes), there will always be such a party; certain to increase every day, and likely to grow more troublesome and more dangerous. It may be called French, or American, but it will become Irish and national: for nine millions of people will at length begin to think they ought to have a country and a name.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR TO MR. GRATTAN.

Ely Place, March 7th, 1807.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—The Catholics are much divided in sentiment, though not at present in action, almost all, I believe I might say all, the persons considerable for their property or situation lament the precipitancy of their proceedings, and would be glad to withdraw their petition, but the violent party in this town urge every thing on, and the others are afraid to take an open and declared part against them, even Keogh and Murphy are become objects of suspicion to many of their own people, and at present, a Mr. Malone, a merchant here, as I believe, is the great leader and driver of the hot-headed party. They have sent for Lord Fingall to town, and want to get him to carry the petition to you earlier than had been intended. The moderate party (I believe it to be the most numerous) would be glad to get out of the scrape entirely, but, as they think that cannot be done, they would be well pleased to have the petition received, and laid upon the table, without ha-

ing any questions put upon it; the others desire a debate, and some, you may rely upon it, wish for a rejection. They are, I think, divided into three parties; the people of property and education, who are contented to postpone their claims; the people of the middling orders, in this and in the country towns, who wish to urge them in a vain hope of carrying them; and the people who wish to urge them on purpose to have them rejected, and *who are to be looked on as real separatists, and the allies of France.* This last party would, I believe, be inconsiderable, if it had not means of imposing on or deluding the others.

From the best information, however, which I can obtain, I think your answer, strongly dissuading them from persevering in their petition, will have a great effect, and if it cannot procure the total abandonment of it, will induce them to acquiesce in its lying silently on the table. They all know my opinion perfectly well, and some of them respect it. I have, however, avoided as much as possible to show too great an anxiety upon the subject, as I have been uniformly of opinion, that it would only tend to encourage and inflame the violent party. One of the objects of the violent men (I speak from certain knowledge) is to cause a breach in the administration, and to separate the Fox from the Grenville part of it—they hope to force the Fox men out—and then they think (to use their own phrase) that they will soon have every thing *their own way.* This would indeed be a great evil, but I trust there is no danger of its befalling us. I am very sorry that I cannot recommend Wallace for a silk gown at present—for it really is not possible—it would offend the whole bar, as there are a great many men his superiors in standing* and business, who must be passed by; and what would make the resentment of the bar stronger than any other man's case, is, that unfortunately he is an unpopular man amongst his own profession—this to yourself. I am doing every thing I can for poor M'Can, and hope soon to get him settled to his satisfaction some how or other. I will write to you again soon.—Yours, always,

G. PONSONBY.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR TO MR. GRATTAN.

Ely Place, Wednesday, 5 o'clock, 1807.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—Murphy has just left me. He

* Lord Erskine was one of the few instances in which a barrister obtained a silk gown after five years' standing.

came to say that he thought the only chance of preventing the presentation of the petition was by pursuing the following course.

To-morrow a letter is to be written (in fact by the committee), signed by Lord Fingall to you, to ask your opinion as to the best time for presenting the petition, and he proposes that you should express your opinion strongly against the presenting it at all; this he thinks will afford the best chance of stopping it—but he is not sure that it will stop it—and he desires that you will not mention his name to any person.

I have now delivered his message, and cannot add any opinion of my own, for I have not lately seen any person upon whom I can rely, and have, indeed, rather avoided it, as I do not choose to show too much anxiety on the subject.—Yours, always,

G. PONSONBY.

Mr. Wallace has been alluded to already, and the following letters from the Secretary are here introduced in order to show that Mr. Grattan did not forget the services of any one who had exerted himself in the cause of his country. Mr. Grattan was accused of having neglected this individual, and of forgetting the efforts that he made against the Union, and a very severe but unjust letter was produced to the author in support of the charge.

The very reverse was the truth; and it will appear that Mr. Grattan took considerable pains on the occasion. But Mr. Wallace, though a very able man, and with a well-earned reputation for his treatise on the trade and manufactures of the country,* as well as for his spirited and ready efforts to oppose a measure that was likely to prove so detrimental to Ireland, was of young

* An Essay, published in 1798, on the Manufactures of Ireland, and those for which her natural advantages are best suited, and the means for improving her manufactures. The work was dedicated to Lord Moira, and was next to the prize essay for which a premium was offered by the Royal Irish Academy. It is replete with local information, and possesses sound and useful observations. The fortunate candidate was Mr. Preston.

standing at the bar, having been called to it only in 1798, and the jealousies, as well as the practice of the profession, stood in his way.

MR. ELLIOT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Dublin Castle, March 10th, 1807.

MY DEAR SIR,—The appointment to the office of king's counsel is never made but with the recommendation of the Chancellor. When you first suggested to me your wishes for the promotion of Mr. Wallace I mentioned the subject to the Chancellor, who stated that Mr. Wallace was junior to several gentlemen at the bar, whose extent of practice gave them a preferable claim to precedence. Since I received your letter of the 5th January (which reached me yesterday), I have, by the Lord Lieutenant's particular instructions, had another conversation with the Chancellor upon this topic; but he perseveres in his opinion that the arrangement could not be made without creating great discontent in the profession, and he apprises me that he has, within these last two or three days, written to you a full explanation of the grounds of his objection.

You will, I am persuaded, do both the Duke and me the justice to believe that we feel the most sincere regret that there should be such insurmountable obstacles to the accomplishment of an object about which you express so much interest.—With the truest regard and esteem, I remain always, my dear Sir, most faithfully yours,

W. ELLIOT.

MR. ELLIOT TO MR. GRATTAN.

Dublin Castle, March 14th, 1807.

MY DEAR SIR,—As the Lord Lieutenant has seen the Chancellor, and answered your letter to me of the 7th instant, I have nothing to add on that subject except to express my most sincere regret that there should be such insuperable obstacles in the way of an arrangement about which you take so deep an interest.

When I last wrote to you I omitted to mention that Mr. John Latouche had intimated an earnest wish that Mr. Riddall* might be one of the sheriffs for the city of Dub-

* A very worthy and public spirited citizen and a man of liberal principles (a dangerous virtue under the dynasty that ruled). He

lin, and you will oblige me by apprising me of your views and sentiments on this point.—Ever, with the truest regard and esteem, my dear Sir, most faithfully yours,

WM. ELLIOT.

The new Parliament met in December, 1806. Lord Lauderdale returned from Paris on the failure of the negotiations for peace with France, after Mr. Fox's death. The papers relating to this subject were laid before Parliament, from which appeared the great attention and anxiety that Mr. Fox had shown in the proceedings; and it is more than probable that, if he had lived, he would have been able to conclude a peace satisfactory and honourable to Great Britain.* The King had sent for Lord Grenville after Mr. Fox's death, and continued the party in power, Lord Howick taking the place of Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Both these individuals were too cold and too haughty for the times and the people. Lord Grenville was an able statesman,—a grave and weighty speaker, and a great debater,—his voice was not pleasing, nor his manner engaging; but he was a powerful rhetorician, and the master of politics. He was not, however, a very practicable man, and did not sufficiently bend to the

called a meeting, as sheriff, in 1810, on a requisition of the freemen and freeholders of Dublin, to petition Parliament for a repeal of the Union. The other sheriff (Stanley) had refused. A piece of plate was voted to Mr. Riddall (afterwards Sir James) as a mark of respect and *gratitude* from his fellow-citizens; "for his *integrity*, which would not yield to influence or menace in the discharge of his *public duty*." From the words of the resolution, it would seem that the Irish did not expect a public officer to do his duty, if the Government did not like it, and this even in the case of a sheriff, who, by the statute of Henry, was *their* officer formerly—elected by them and not by the Government. They judged right—for this worthy man was ever after an object disliked by the authorities, because he had acted for the people in discharging his duty according to his oath.

* Talleyrand, in a despatch of the month of April, writes to Fox, "Your communication has a character of openness and precision which we have hitherto never seen in the communications between your court and us."

ways or the manners of others. He was too reserved, and too much of a recluse, and he loved to retire to a barren country spot, where he could cultivate nothing but an ignorance of mankind.

Lord Howick (Grey) was a different character. He was a man of high talent, very learned, of great integrity, and first-rate ability; he possessed a lofty spirit and a princely port of mind. His principles were excellent, and his eloquence great; his speaking, if not of the highest order, was pure in style, and his language was superior. His address was graceful; his figure imposing and dignified. A handsome person aided in exhibiting him as a perfect gentleman.* But aristocracy and nobility were engrafted in his essence. He wanted manner and temper to carry a point, or keep together a party, and never would have been a great favourite, either with the King or the people; the one would have looked upon him as a rival, and the other as a master, and neither would have greatly liked him as a minister; so that he never could have enjoyed very long either power or popularity. As a philosopher, he showed want of judgment; as a statesman, he showed want of prudence. On the question (in 1815) of peace with Buonaparte, he went too far; and in his Reform Bill (in 1832) he did not go far enough; and in both cases feared to use the weapons that the country and the constitution had furnished him.

He seemed to be the inheritor of Fox's errors and imprudence. Instead of remaining quiet when he came into power—knowing full well that the King would turn him out on the first opportunity—he brought forward a measure which in its nature was partial, and which would have

* See Life of Lord Eldon, vol. ii. The King's remarks on this.

procured little thanks from the Catholics,* and was certain to bring against them all the cunning and enmity of the King. The bill merely granted to English Catholics certain military privileges enjoyed by the Irish. It was of little consequence in itself; but its principle was exactly what the King disliked. He accordingly objected, and the measure was abandoned; and on that the party were turned out. Thus they lost office on account of a measure which in itself was nothing, and which nothing they gave up. In this Lord Grey followed the dictates of his own understanding, which was very defective; and the Whigs showed they were men of talent and integrity, but not of commanding ability. The proceeding was a most unfortunate one for the country, and proved a death-blow to the Whig interest.

On the 5th of March Lord Howick moved for leave to bring in a bill to open offices in the army and navy to all his Majesty's subjects. The Irish act of 1793 allowed Catholics to hold commissions in the army, and the object of the measure was to communicate to the English the same privileges. The bill was opposed by Mr. Perceval, and the second reading fixed for that day week. Meantime the anti-Catholic party were excited, and the King was applied to. He had known the nature of the measure, and expressed no disapprobation of it; but the Dukes of York and Cumberland, Lord Eldon, Lord Hawkesbury, and Lord Sidmouth having had interviews with him, he sent for Lord Grenville and Lord Grey, and asserted that there existed a misunderstanding on the subject, and required of them to abandon the bill. They complied. He then required a written pledge that they would not recommend any further concessions to the Catholics. Very properly they

* See Mr. Keogh's speech at the Catholic meeting, 18th April, 1807.

refused to comply, and were dismissed accordingly. Lord Grey and Lord Grenville stated in their places in Parliament the history of the transaction, from which it appeared that the old system of duplicity and intrigue, practised in the time of Lord Fitzwilliam by Mr. Pitt, had been now practised by the King and his friends on Lord Grey and Lord Grenville, and a most daring and unconstitutional attempt there made was frustrated only by the stern virtue of the Ministers.

Mr. Grattan's opinion was expressed in his letter to the Duke of Bedford; but it is to be observed, that he was not consulted on the expediency of bringing in the bill. If he had been, he most unquestionably would have been opposed to such a step. He had just a week before *assisted in getting out of the way of the Ministry* that which would have proved a certain stumbling-block (the Catholic petition). He knew the character of the King; he had learned it in 1795. He put the Catholics on their guard against him, and he saved them; but Lord Grey precipitated the Whig party, and by his imprudent move he sunk them for ever.

Mr. Grattan to the Duke of Bedford.

London, March 16th, 1807.

My Lord,—In consequence of a conversation with Lord Howick regarding the Catholic Military Bill, I beg to trouble your Grace with a few lines. The question was, whether the Ministry should give up the substance of the bill or their situations.* And when it was suggested to me by his Lordship how far Ireland was concerned, I gave it as my opinion, the breaking up of the present Ministry would be to Ireland a mischief not to be repaired; whether we consider who the Ministry were who went out, or who

* Alluding to this, Lord Castlereagh, in the debate of the 25th May, 1808, on the Roman Catholic petition, said, in a language peculiar to himself, that "*the Whigs had put the bantling in their pockets.*"

those were who should succeed them. That the point was too small, and the sacrifice too great. That a change in the Irish administration would have such an effect upon Ireland, at this moment, on the feelings as well as the interest of the country, as to threaten ultimately with the most painful consequences, the British empire. And though it might be awkward to recede, yet in such a dilemma the mischief on one side was more to be considered than personal feelings on the other. It occurred that your Grace's difficulties might be considerable, but that, however painful it must be to all the members of the Ministry, particularly to Lord Howick, who stood more advanced in the business, yet that it were more prudent and more conscientious to submit to a temporary mortification, than to incur the solid and lasting evil that must ensue if your Grace were at this time to quit the government of Ireland. In this persuasion I answered Lord Howick, giving that opinion which I beg to repeat now to your Grace, with an account of the conversation.—I have the honour to be, your Grace's very obedient humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

On the 18th of April the Roman Catholics assembled in Dublin to consider the steps that should be taken in reference to their claims. Lord Fingall acted as chairman. This individual, the head of one of the oldest Catholic families, was beloved and respected by all who knew him or who marked his progress. He was firmly attached to his country, to her rights, and to his religion, and was not to be shaken or seduced from her service. In times of need he stood fearlessly by her; he was a safe adviser,—mild but resolute,—and he proved an excellent mediator between a justly offended people and a virulent exasperating Government. He tempered the feelings of both, without yielding to either, and held with dignity the course which he thought would prove most conducive to the interests of his country. He had applied to Mr. Grattan,

and received from him the letters which were read to the meeting.

MR. GRATTAN TO LORD FINGALL.

London, March 21st, 1807.

MY LORD,—I had the honour of receiving your Lordship's letter of the 14th of this month, informing me that the Catholics had determined to lay their case this session before Parliament, and had selected me for that purpose.

Your Lordship's letter was accompanied by a copy of the Catholic petition, and requested to have my advice regarding the proper period for presenting the same, so that it might be considered before the end of the session.

I beg to return my thanks to the Catholics for the honour they have done me, and the confidence they have placed in me; but I should be unworthy of both if I did not add, that considering their subject in every point of view, and with reference to their own particular interest, I am of opinion that a motion in Parliament on the Catholic petition would now be injurious to the Catholics.

The probable or actual change of Ministry does not alter that opinion, but tends to confirm it; but as it will be highly proper, if not absolutely necessary, that there should be some communication with the friends of the Catholics here, who supported them in Parliament, and who have given testimonies of their sincerity, I will endeavour to obtain a meeting of such as soon as possible, in order that, before their measures shall be brought forward, the Catholics may know the sentiments of their friends; which I will transmit with my best regards.—I have the honour to be, with great esteem and regard, your Lordship's most faithful humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

SAME TO SAME.

London, March, 1807.

MY LORD,—I beg your Lordship will return my sincere thanks to the committee for the kindness they were so good as to express in your Lordship's letter.

I endeavoured to collect as many persons as I could, of those who wish well to the claims of the Catholics and are

their decided friends. They met yesterday, and their opinion they authorized me to communicate to your Lordship, which is as follows:—"That they continue to be of opinion that the prosecution of the Catholic petition at this time would not be an advisable measure."

I gave your Lordship my own opinion in a former letter, which was the same as the above; and I beg to conclude by expressing my unalterable regard for the Catholic body and my high respect for your Lordship, and for those qualities of prudence and moderation for which you are so justly distinguished.—I have the honour to be, your Lordship's very obedient humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

A long debate arose on the Catholic meeting and the change of ministry; and the measure that led to it, formed, naturally, the subject of consideration. Mr. Keogh, the *Nestor* of the Catholic cause, took the lead. He attached little value to the military bill—to Ireland it would have been of very little service—but the conduct of the ministers in refusing to sign a most unconstitutional pledge, such as was required by the King, in direct contradiction to the tenor of their oaths, received from him a great and eloquent tribute of admiration, to which the entire assembly responded with loud and continued applause. Mr. Keogh concluded by moving that the petition should be entrusted to the care of Lord Fingall, subject to its future disposal by the Catholic body. Mr. O'Connell, on this occasion, made a very judicious speech in support of this proposition, and deprecated any division among their body. After much discussion, the question was carried, and this special mark of confidence was reposed in Lord Fingall, who considered it most advisable to follow the opinions of their friends in Parliament, and not to urge their claims during this Session. A resolution, expressing the gratitude of the Catholics to the Duke of Bedford, for his

mild and dignified conduct, and the deep regret they felt at his departure, was unanimously adopted, to which his Grace replied as follows.

DUKE OF BEDFORD'S ANSWER TO THE CATHOLICS.

21st April, 1807.

The Resolutions which your Lordship has been pleased to convey to me, as the sense of that great and loyal body, the Roman Catholics of Ireland, claims my warmest acknowledgments. In the discharge of the arduous trust committed to my hands by his Majesty, it has been my constant and earnest endeavour to promote the interests and prosperity of this part of the United Kingdom, and in now relinquishing that trust, in obedience to his Majesty's commands, I retire to the less anxious cares of private life, cheered by a conscious feeling within me, that to the best of my imperfect judgment and abilities, I have done my duty to my sovereign and my country. In whatever station I may hereafter be placed, be assured, my Lord, that I shall never cease to entertain the most fervent wishes for the happiness of every class and description of my fellow-subjects in this part of the British empire.

BEDFORD.

At this period, Mr. Preston, who had been appointed one of the Commissioners of Appeals, died,* and thus a vacancy was occasioned, which, by good fortune, was got by Lady Granard for Mr. Hardy; the salary was only 500*l.* a-year, and the expenses attending it, which were of necessity increased by Hardy's residence in the country, amounted to near two, so his reward was but small.

* His death has been attributed to Mr. Henry Deane Grady. Preston had got wet in coming to court, and neglected to change his clothes. Mr. Grady, in pleading before him, spoke for five hours, and was obliged, as he said, to conclude because "*his legs were tired.*" It concluded poor Preston's life, who got ill in consequence and never recovered. This Mr. Grady was the person who voted for the Union, and who was rewarded by an office that produced, not like Hardy's a few hundreds, but several thousand pounds a year. In this handsome manner did the *British undertakers in Ireland*, aid the corruption of the times, and carry their Union.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. M'Can.

London, March 28th, 1807.

My dear M'Can,—Do not let Hardy want money to pay his patent, if he has not gotten it already. James will get it for him out of my rents.

You see all is over—I am sorry for it—but I think the present ministry cannot continue. I am vexed about your situation, but it cannot be helped—things may mend hereafter. The business about Wallace has also vexed me. I am called to dinner, but will write on Monday.—Yours, ever,

H. G.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. Berwick.

London, April 18th, 1807.

My dear Doctor,—The mortality of human affairs you preach—and your friends experience. I am sorry on many accounts, the country and my friends.

However, I am comforted that Hardy has gotten into post, though not heavy laden. Poor Preston, whom he succeeded, gave me affliction in his death, as he has given me many pleasant days in his life. He was well read, and had considerable political talents; he loved liberty, though an Acadmie, and in the predicament of poverty, retained the spirit of independence. He did, however, latterly betray an ardour for office, and a spleen at disappointment, which was unworthy of him. The Curate, whom you mention, I am certain would discharge the business of agency well, but the brother of the late agent, I believe we must not appoint. Remember me to Mrs. Berwick. I should be glad if I were to dine with you to-morrow at Esker, to walk in your garden, and talk with Mathew,* if he is there. I hope you will get something under the present ministry, more than you did under the last, even with the assistance of Warburton. The Archbishop seems to have acted at the Sheriff's feast a *decorous and a liberal part.*†

* The old gardener at Esker.

† These city feasts were long a disgrace to civilization, though patronized by British lord lieutenants and secretaries, who celebrated its orgies. Party tunes were played, insulting toasts were given, and bigotted sentiments had utterance and approbation from the retainers of an alien Government, who not only were permitted to rob and to revile the people, but who were rewarded for their sedition. It took years to abolish these public nuisances, but not till their corporate revenues were squandered and lost, and the *glorious* body became bank-

What do you think of the Duke of Cumberland's letter* to the University? What can you think of it? Do not say if you look to advancement. Remember me to all friends, and believe me,—Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

The Whigs having been thus unceremoniously and unconstitutionally ejected by his Majesty, the No-Popery party got the ascendant,† and Mr. Perceval, who took the lead on the occasion, arranged the administration as follows. Though some of the principal members were appointed on the 25th of March, the arrangements were not completed till the 14th of April.

New Administration, 25th March, 1807, commonly called the No-Popery Administration.

President of the Council, Earl Camden.
Lord High Chancellor, Lord Eldon.

---

rupt. Mr. Grattan's remark is *ironical*, for when the Archbishop of Dublin (Agar's) health was drunk, his Grace said, "I return my cordial thanks to Sheriff Manders and the company for the honour they have done me. *I take this opportunity of congratulating my fellow-citizens on the recent triumph of the constitution in Church and State.*" This was followed by a rapturous burst of applause from the whole company, which continued at least fifteen minutes.—(Extract from the Journal of the day.)

* He had attempted to rouse the anti-Catholic feeling, and to get up petitions in favour of the No-Popery cry. Mr. Plunket, in the ensuing session, commented most severely on his conduct; in fact, where morals or propriety were respected, no such character as the Duke of Cumberland should have been tolerated.

† Lord Hardwicke had a private audience of the King; having been five years in Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, he was well able to judge what was likely to be the effects of such a change; he ventured to remonstrate with the King, and submitted to him the expediency, after the military bill had been abandoned, of continuing the Whig ministers, and frankly told him that the proposed change would certainly alienate the Irish from England, and that the cry of the church being in danger, would create most injurious divisions among the people. His Majesty listened with great politeness, but observed that the intentions of the persons who *had advised him* were good—fatal advice; in a few years afterwards the discord and agitation occasioned by this subject, drove the King distracted, and deprived him of his reason for ever. An allusion of Mr. Pitt in one of his speeches, makes it more than probable that he foresaw this very danger, but he guarded against it in a very different way from that which Mr. Perceval had the imprudence to resort to.

Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Westmoreland.
First Lord of the Treasury, Duke of Portland.
First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Mulgrave.
Master General of the Ordnance, Earl of Chatham.
Secretary of State for the Home Department, Lord Hawkesbury (since Earl of Liverpool).
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. George Canning.
Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies, Lord Viscount Castlereagh.
Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, Lord Ellenborough.
Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer, Spencer Perceval.
President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India, Right Hon. Robert Saunders Dundas.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Right Hon. Spencer Perceval.
President of the Board of Trade, Earl Bathurst.
Secretary at War, Sir James Pulteney.
Treasurer of the Navy, Mr. George Rose.
Joint Paymasters-General, Lord Charles Somerset, Right Hon. Charles Long.
Joint Postmasters-General, Earl of Chichester, Earl of Sandwich.
Secretaries of the Treasury, W. Huskisson, Esq., Hon. Henry Wellesley.
Master of the Rolls, Sir William Grant.
Attorney-General, Sir Vicary Gibbs.
Solicitor-General, Sir Thomas Plomer.

Ireland.

Lord Lieutenant, Duke of Richmond.
Lord High Chancellor, Lord Manners.
Chief Secretary, Sir Arthur Wellesley (afterwards Duke of Wellington).
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. John Foster.
Attorney-General, Mr. William Saurin.
Solicitor-General, Mr. Charles Kendal Bushe.

This administration collected in itself all the servility and bigotry of the age, and his Majesty knew them so well, that he did not find it necessary to administer to them the pledge which their predecessors had refused, or tell them that upon that test depended their tenure of office; in fact, in every sense of the word, they were his *servants*, and there is not to be found, in the catalogue of British Governments, a body of men so slavish and so tyrannical. They were the relics of the Irish and English parties who had so signally failed both abroad and at home, and had brought the Empire to the brink of ruin. They had talent without principle—theology without charity—ambition without strength or honesty, and the lust of power without grandeur or generosity. They were

possessed of a rhetoric just sufficient to keep them clear of common sense, and with minds too heavy to be perfect orators, or too frivolous to be able politicians—pliant to the king, oppressive to the people—at the feet of the one, and treading upon the other. Among them appeared some of the old Irish Court, who had nurtured religious discord and civic strife, till they grew with rapid and fatal training—destructive to Ireland and detrimental to the connection—Lord Westmoreland, who had fostered the Orangemen; Lord Camden, who had *recruited* the United Irishmen; Lord Castlereagh, who had hanged some, tortured others, transported numbers, and sold all. There was the Duke of Portland too, metamorphosed from 1782 into the deceiver of Lord Fitzwilliam in 1795, and the supporter of No-Popery in 1807; and last, not least, Lord Eldon, the "Buttress of the Church," because he seldom entered one, the Capital of the State, because he weighed upon it, the Judge of quarter of a century in arrear, except when deciding against Ireland. Among them was to be found a different character—a man of great ambition and surprising talent—a strong, able, and brilliant speaker; he adorned his eloquence with a fine taste and beautiful imagery; possessed great powers of sarcasm, and could be at once very humorous and very severe, and turn his adversary into ridicule* with a success unequalled. But, unfortunately, George Canning wanted simplicity of mind, elevation of principle, and rectitude of character,† and there was a propensity to compromise in what he said, that deprived his fine qualities of half their merit; yet he injured himself, not by his ambition, but by the impatience of his ambition—he was wrong to trifle with the

* His reply to Sir John Cox Hippesly could never be forgotten.

† Speech in 1812, and negotiations with Lords Moira and Wellesley, &c.

sufferings of the people.* Other men could wait and calculate, but Canning would not stop for that, he acted so precipitously, and scattered his shot around on all sides, so that his party were never certain that they would not be disbanded at a moment's warning. Want of candour led him into an unseemly conflict with his colleague, Lord Castlereagh,† of which the latter quickly availed himself to raise a character sunk below the ordinary level. Having thus given an advantage to a rival, to whom he stood as superior in talent as in feeling, he took office under his administration, and sunk his fame, as a statesman, in the quality of ambassador to the Court of Lisbon, and thus revoked the sentence he had passed upon him of *declared incapacity*. He made a motion, at one period, in favour of the Catholics,‡ though he was not very friendly to Ireland, for in his mind she was rather an object of apprehension than affection. On the whole, he would have been a greater character, if he had not been trained up by Mr. Pitt, if he had not associated with Mr. Perceval, and if he had kept clear of Lord Castlereagh.

The leader of the No-Popery administration was Mr. Spencer Perceval; he formed and, in himself, composed the administration. He was a smart barrister and a gentleman; an active individual, and skilful in his profession. He had been Attorney-General in 1802, Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1807, to which he united the office of First Lord of the Treasury in 1809. He was a sharp, clever, bitter, little personage; fluent and argumentative; a fair stater of his adversary's argument, and very satirical. He was abroad in all

* 1818, "The ruptured Ogden," "ignorant impatience of taxation;" "a transition from war to peace;" were among the phrases of Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh, that the people of England never forgot.

† 1809, on the unsuccessful expedition to Walcheren.

‡ June 12th, 1812.

weathers, generally spoke pretty well, never very ill; made little points, and turned them cleverly. He was a good man in private, but of a narrow and contracted mind; it was that of a *nisi prius* lawyer, not a statesman. He viewed everything with the eye of an attorney, and seemed to think all matters should be a source of strife, and that the world was a court for litigation, not a haven for repose, or even a school of probation. He was active on his little perch, and squirrel-like played his tricks well and dexterously; but when he assumed the reins of power he lost himself, and showed that he was not only not a statesman, but that he was quite unfit to govern; he forgot that it was necessary to divest himself of his narrow ideas and his pitiful projects, and that he could not govern an empire as a clerk would a parish. His principles were prerogative in the State, and intolerance in the Church. He stooped before royal authority, and yielded to the Prince Regent; encouraged him in his fancies and extravagance; gratified him in laying out parks and building barracks; flattered him in his vices; indulged him in his expenses, winked at his connection with Hertford House; and adhered to two rules: first, to sacrifice the country to the Sovereign; and, secondly, to sacrifice it to the Church. He was a bigot, and no bigot should be minister of a mixed empire like Great Britain. He occasioned a war with America, and, if he had lived, he would have occasioned an insurrection in Ireland, for he carefully observed one principle—that of intolerance. He was a mischievous public man, contracted and puritanical—good as to morals, but as to the State ruinous; almost the very worst minister that any king could possibly select; he united the prejudices of the lawyer to those of the churchman, and possessed the narrowness of both

professions; in fact, his religion was a nuisance to his country. His opposition to Reform did not occasion his death; his assassination was horrible, but accidental;* for he was good enough to have many private friends, and not great enough to have violent public enemies.†

A few days only were suffered to elapse before the Parliament, chosen under the auspices of the Whigs, was put upon its trial. There were three different points before them: the Catholics, Ireland, and the Constitution, and in all three they decided for the Crown, against the Whigs, and in favour of No Popery. On the 9th of April, Mr. Brand moved, that it was contrary to the first duties of the confidential servants of the Crown, to restrain themselves by any pledge expressed or implied, from offering to the King any advice which the course of circumstances might render necessary, for the welfare and security of any part of his Majesty's extensive empire. On a division, the numbers for the order of the day were 258, against it 226—thus the new ministers got a majority of 32. On this occasion, Mr. (afterwards Lord) Plunket made a most able speech, severely commenting on the conduct of the Duke of Cumberland, chancellor of Dublin University, in disturbing the peace of that body by repeated applications to procure from them a petition against the Catholics. In reply to Mr. Perceval, a very impressive speech was made by Mr. Grattan, and a most effective one by Sir Samuel Romilly. The

* He was shot in the lobby of the House of Commons on the 11th of May, 1812, by John Bellingham, a lunatic.

† He refused to permit *Peruvian bark* to be imported into France or her possessions, and brought in the bill for that purpose, but his countrymen paid dearly for this uncharitable restriction, for when the ill-fated expedition to Walcheren took place, thousands of the troops fell victims to fever and ague, for which bark was the only effectual remedy. The foreign physicians reproached the British with the cruelty of their ministers.

minister, however, denied that the King had any adviser as to the pledge required.

The Commons were again tried but as ineffectually, on the 13th April, when Mr. Lyttleton moved "That the House, considering a firm and vigilant administration indispensable in the present posture of public affairs, has seen, with the greatest regret, the late change in his Majesty's councils."*

After a long and animated debate, at seven o'clock in the morning, the numbers proved to be, for the previous question 244, against it 198, majority for Mr. Perceval's administration 46. In the debate, the allusions made to Ireland were frequent. Mr. Tighe observed, that the people of Ireland had been accustomed to view with cold determined apathy all changes in the administration here, as none of those changes were attended with benefit to them. Since the Union, Ireland had felt no community of rights—no community of commerce—the only community it felt was that of having one hundred assessors in the British Parliament, who were to give ineffectual votes for the interest of their country as he might do that night.

Sir John Newport, in alluding to the conduct of the Whigs, said, they had appointed a commission to inquire into the application of the funds vested in Ireland for the purposes of public education. These funds, Lord Castlereagh, then at the head of the Irish Government, but now a member of

* In the Lords, a motion nearly similar was made by the Marquis of Stafford, on which Lord Boringdon moved an adjournment which was carried by 171 to 90, giving the minister a majority of 81. The late ministers having been reproached with abandoning the military bill, Lord Grenville alluded to Lord Castlereagh, who had imported that question from Ireland, to carry which he stood pledged to that country, and therefore he referred his opponents to him, as more conversant in solving difficulties that arise from tergiversation. The conduct of Mr. Perceval was greatly reprobated, particularly his address to his constituents of Northampton, where he stated, that he was making a stand for his Sovereign, and a stand for the Protestant religion, and calling upon the people to second him with their exertions.

the Cabinet, had suffered to remain shamefully appropriated to individual interest and corrupt purposes, though the report of a committee had imperiously called on him to reform them. To his knowledge they had been misapplied for a length of time, and for mere private benefit.

On the 27th of April the Parliament was prorogued, and immediately dissolved. In the speech of the Commissioners, the King was made to state, that he resorted to this measure *while the events that had recently taken place were fresh in the recollection of the people; and that the Roman Catholics must feel assured of his attachment to the principles of a just and enlightened toleration.* How this could be reconciled to the cry of "No-Popery," which his Ministers set up, is not easy to be understood; it seemed to be a species of mockery, and rather to add insult to injury; but it was quite in unison with the conduct of the Tory party throughout their long dominion, in the course of which they fully exemplified the truth of the maxim "*odisse quem læsisse.*" The object which the Ministers had in view proved successful. By means of their inflammatory appeal, they increased their majority in the House of Commons far beyond their calculation. The "No-Popery" cry resounded throughout England; and though, as Mr. Grattan observed, the Irish did not write on their walls "*No-England,*" in reply to "No-Popery," yet Ireland felt deeply the insult, though she bore with magnanimity the infliction. The most unconstitutional proceedings took place at the elections, and acts of a most violent and illegal nature; the King's name was prostituted on all sides, and to vote against the "No-Popery" candidate was tantamount to voting against the King. By such flagitious acts as these they swelled their numbers so much, that when Parliament met, on the 22nd of June, an amendment proposed by Lord Howick

to condemn the dissolution of the Parliament, was defeated by a majority of 195,—350 voting for the address, and 155 against it. The career of the party shortly after commenced. They restored Mr. Giffard (a violent Orange corporator* of Dublin) to his office, with full salary from the period of his dismissal by Lord Hardwicke; they diminished the vote to the Catholic College of Maynooth from 13,000*l.* a year, which had been granted by the Whigs, to 9,000*l.*; and they appointed Dr. Duigenan to the office of Privy Councillor. They sent the Duke of Richmond to Ireland as Lord-Lieutenant, who quickly fell into the track, and mixed in the revels of the Corporation politics. They sent Lord Manners as Chancellor, who was equally prejudiced as a statesman, and deficient as a judge, and was, at the same time, weak and violent. Together, they formed a heedless and a blind administration; they did things they should not have done, and tolerated things they should not have permitted, and brought the country to the verge of insurrection.

The measures that caused some division among the opposition were the Insurrection and the Arms Acts. They had been prepared by the late, and were found in the office by the new Ministers, and, on the 9th of July, Sir Arthur Wellesley (Duke of Wellington), the Secretary for Ireland, moved for leave to bring them in. The former of these measures had been passed by the Irish Parliament in 1796, for one year, afterwards for two, and at the Union for seven. It came now to be renewed; and a clause directing that persons arrested under it should be tried at quarter

* Murders and outrages of the most violent description took place in several parts of Ireland where religious feuds had been excited, and the impunity which followed them reflected the greatest disgrace on the administrators of the law and the government of the country; in many cases they led to frightful, though distant, retaliation—one of the melancholy results of civil and religious discord.

sessions, before the assistant barrister and the bench of magistrates, with the assistance of a sergeant-at-law specially sent for the occasion, had been introduced by the Whig Ministers, they had also given the sergeant a negative voice, which the Tories took away; and with this alteration the measure was proposed.

Mr. Grattan probably thought that the mere circumstance of a strong act being enforced by a Tory instead of a Whig Government, was not of itself a sufficient reason to make him refuse his assent to a measure of his own party. He had been informed by Mr. Ponsonby (as already stated) that French sentiments were prevalent in some men's minds in Ireland, and by Mr. Elliot (the late Secretary) that nightly and dangerous meetings also were held in various parts of the country; accordingly he supported the principle of the bill, but objected to some of its details, and in particular to the term of its duration. He might also have conceived that the Catholic question (of which, in all his political movements, he never lost sight) would derive benefit by his showing that he could not be induced, through party motives or popular outcry, to abandon a measure that he considered necessary for the country, however much that measure may have trenched upon the constitution. He certainly raised his character among the English for stoical firmness and independence of mind and principle.

All this, however, was not sufficient to prevent the outcry which was raised against him in Ireland, and with which he was assailed in a variety of publications; but his opinion remained unshaken, as appears from the remarks in the letters that follow.

The subject was again brought before Parliament at the close of the session, when Mr. Sheri-

dan, in a very able and eloquent speech, made a motion on the state of Ireland, pledging the House to take it into consideration in the ensuing year, with a view to render unnecessary the continuance of the two bills they had passed. Mr. Grattan here defended the course he had taken in reference to them,—that he did not speak against Ireland, but that he advocated the cause of Ireland against France. He submitted the case of Ireland in three points of view,—education, agriculture, and religion.

On the first he observed, that a commission had been issued. It appeared that, by royal donation, 8,000 acres of land had been granted for grammar-schools; they produced 5,000*l.* a year, and, if fairly let, should bring a great deal more. The number of scholars were but 300, of which 58 only were free scholars. One school, whose fund was but 100*l.* per annum, educated 40; while others, whose funds were 5,000*l.*, educated only 18!

This statement proved that the plan had failed. Two or more large schools should therefore be established, and there should be a principal school in every parish. By the 12th of Elizabeth, every diocese should maintain a school; so there should be 34 free grammar-schools, besides those of royal foundation, and there were considerable funds also from individuals to support the grammar-schools.

By the 28th of Henry VIII., the clergy were obliged to provide each parish with an English school. In 1788, it appeared that in less than 400 of these schools, 11,000 children were educated; he contended that they should educate the poor as well as the rich, and that, if the present laws were properly enforced, education would be provided for the people of Ireland.

The second point was agriculture,—this would

be improved by the removal of tithes; the late disturbances in Ireland arose from them — the Right Boy, the White Boy, the Hearts of Steel— insurrection arose from tithes. The three plans suggested, were substitution by land, by modus, and by salary; the first was slow and difficult, the second was less embarrassing and was a recognised idea, the third appeared to be the best; a commission should be appointed to ascertain the receipts of each living, and the clergy should be secured against the depreciation of money by a periodical valuation of the produce of land, and the sum ascertained should be paid like county appointments.

The third point was religion, and here he said the success of the Catholic claims would be secured by themselves; the course of the Catholics, or a great proportion of her inhabitants, was such as might decide the fate of the empire, and the part they took on this occasion might decide their own; and she would find credit and security in the suppression of every kind of insurrection, in the determination to resist a foreign yoke, and in the oblivion, most absolute and unfeigned, of all animosities on account of religion. If she looks for examples she may find them in other nations, she may find them in her own. As she felt in 1779, when she recovered her trade—as she felt in 1782, when she recovered her constitution—she may find at once credit and security. But the door of the temple was shut, and the Catholic was excluded—Government had no right to enter into the sanctuary of the human mind and decide between man and his Redeemer; and England should not allow any narrow policy to prevent her making the Irish Protestants a people, by making the Irish Catholics freemen.

The minister did not take Mr. Grattan's advice on any one of these points; and as to Mr. Sheri-

dan's motion for an inquiry into the state of Ireland, Government rejected it by 76 to 33.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

July 26th, 1807.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I never received the petition of the merchants, nor any letter on the subject. I have left London and gotten to a place within three miles of it, where Mrs. Grattan will have better air.

Our business in Parliament is nearly at an end. Parliament itself will be up in a few weeks: regarding the Insurrection Bill, I can only say that the bill ought to pass, and therefore I voted and spoke for it; I am very sorry the people of Dublin should be of a different opinion, as I always wish to have their concurrence. I shall send you the last speech I made on the subject, but I fear it will give but little satisfaction, being stronger than the first.—Yours, ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

Hammersmith, 10th August, 1807.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I am happy in your approbation, I had rather have it than the shout of popular applause. It would be impossible to please the people of Ireland, if, on a question like the last, they should turn upon me. I know not whether they will change their sentiments, but I know I shall not change mine. Some of the Opposition took up the question as a good party measure, on which to squib the Ministry—their arguments made no impression. I happened not to be in the House the last night of debating the Arms Bill, as no debate was expected, nor notice given that the debate which had taken place on the last night would be resumed on another. I should have voted as before.

I am sorry the priest has been killed;* this is the second priest in your neighbourhood that has met with that fate. Was Vesey at the funeral—you were right in going to it. If every clergyman acted on the same principle, religion would have more credit and more peace. I shall see you soon, as I mean to go to Ireland in less than a month, and

* Rev. Mr. M'Carten, who was waylaid and killed on the highway near Lucan by robbers.

shall spend some days with you. Where is Hardy? how is Hardy? I fancy Lord Charlemont's Life is forgotten, and yet he will not be able to pay his debts out of his income. I think he has lost an opportunity of profit and credit; remember me to him. Mrs. Grattan is really better, but she has not the use of her limbs, and is liable to short relapses every change of weather. She will not be able to come with me to Ireland—so that her illness has overset us very much; we have gotten, for two months, a small house and garden near Hammersmith; it is very convenient, but too near the road; however, we enjoy in it retirement, and in some degree, the country.

Parliament will be prorogued immediately. You see what a situation we are in, and what our grand coalitions have ended in. Remember us to Mrs. Berwick and the children, and believe me, yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

Hammersmith, August 18th, 1807.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—The expense of the last election you mention, has been paid, and is 3,000*l.*; it cannot be helped*—*but I will pay it myself.* I could not understand by the letter by whom it has been paid—if by subscription, I'll pay it to the subscribers; let me know.

I shall have sent an extract of my last speech to you in a few days; the speech will not please those who make the present outcry, nor do I intend it should.

I am glad to find, from the letters I receive, that my conduct on the two bills has been much approved of.

I shall write to Mrs. L——† soon. Tell her not to regard the outcry—you can best explain to her how little it deserves attention.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

Hammersmith, 26th August, 1807.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I have sent a draft of the substance

* These various elections, and the expenses consequent thereon, cost his family upwards of 50,000*l.* The Reform Bill has in this respect been of great service to the public and to individuals, preserving the morals of the one and the independence of the other.

† His sister.

of the speech—send it to Webb, but not as coming from me. It was taken by another hand; and it may be published as a pamphlet, if necessary. I wish that part of it which is written in another hand should be copied out, the copy sent to him, and the original destroyed. I will not have the bills published with it; it were to enter into a defence of my conduct against a senseless outcry.

One reason why I send the draft is to show that I do not respect that outcry.—Yours ever,

H. G.

The writer of the letter which the subjoined is a reply was one of Mr. Grattan's agents in the city election; he well knew all the various meetings and factions in the county, and the feelings and dispositions of the people—no man was better aware of the existence of a discontented party in Ireland than he was, but that discontent was the natural and necessary consequence of the long misgovernment of the country; *the error was the leaning towards France*, the remedy was the union of all Irishmen—if they had become national, their country would have been free, prosperous, and happy.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. WM. STERNE HART.

London, August 28th, 1807.

MY DEAR HART,—I thank you for your letter, it was the letter of a friend, which character I have always found in you.

I got the newspaper with the resolutions of the parishes against the Paving Bill. As to what you mention regarding the Insurrection Act, I am sure it made me enemies; but at the same time my conviction was, that the bill was by no means what its enemies represented it to be, and that these very enemies had made it necessary. I am sure there were worthy men who disapproved of the bill. But those who abused me most for that measure, and continue to do so, would, if the French came, join them; there is a great difference between opposing the measures of Government, as you say very truly, and supporting the French;

you and I only mean to do the former, but there are many who abuse us because we would not do the latter.

I perceive by the newspaper and by the letter which you sent me, and by different letters and resolutions which I have received, that Dublin is very angry about the new Paving Bill, and I am not surprised at it. I thank you for your advice about it, it was the advice of a friend, and as such I esteem it.—I am, my dear Hart, yours most truly, HENRY GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. HENRY GRATTAN, JUN.

August 29th, 1807.

MY DEAR HENRY,—The English Parliamentary Debates are in the study near the escrutoire—they, with many years' interruption, come down to the year 1804—the speeches of the great speakers only are worth reading, and those not always. Johnston is supposed to have written the speeches in the time of Sir Robert Walpole. Those since are very indifferently taken, but worth reading on the leading questions—viz., French war, slave trade, negotiation for peace, treaty of Amiens, and some few other subjects. I will bring the debates from 1804 to this year, to Ireland—I have bought them.

You never read Montesquieu—you will find two sets in the library—the worst is the best for reading, as it is dirty already. Abbé Raynal is in the study or in Mrs. Grattan's room, in French; it is worth reading, if you have time to spare from college studies. How is Mr. Gannon ?* remember me to him most particularly. No news in England—every one in expectation of news from Copenhagen,† probably this day an account will arrive. M'Can is a little distracted, and he seems to think of nothing but two bills‡ which he has not seen, and the noise of some people in Dublin.

I was happy to hear of your success,§ you are right to

* The private tutor; fellow of college afterwards.

† The English bombarded Copenhagen *without notice*, and took away the Danish fleet; they were often called upon to pay for the injuries they committed, and the question of Danish claims was brought before Parliament so late even as the year 1844.

‡ The Insurrection and Arms Bills.

§ In the Historical Society of Dublin College, an excellent institution, where silver medals were awarded for prizes in History, Composition, and Oratory.

apply yourself to composition, such an application will make you read with observation.

Do not forget to *rise early*, and have fixed hours for study, and do not forget the Latin and Greek which you have gotten by heart—it is a great advantage to have the beautiful passages of Homer, Horace, and Virgil by heart. Read out loud, without straining your voice, passages in the three languages, Greek, Latin, and English.

I wish you would keep up your knowledge of the French language, it is of the last consequence to speak it with fluency and apprehend it with ease—no man is a gentleman without it. I do not call myself a gentleman for that reason. I thought Catalani* would astonish and charm—she amazed and delighted me.—Yours ever,

H. G.

Henry Grattan, Jun., Esq., Tinnehinch, Bray, Ireland.

* The celebrated vocal performer, whose charms of voice and beauty of person were fully equalled by the goodness of her heart and the excellence of her understanding; she still lives at Florence, where the author saw her last year, respected and beloved by all who know her. She came to Ireland in 1807; and the impression she made, and the applause she drew forth, was surprising. She was visited by the first people of the country, who eagerly invited her to their houses, and at Tinnehinch she was received with the greatest regard and affection. Mr. Grattan, who was passionately fond of Italian music, was delighted with her talent and her manner of execution, which were superior to any thing ever heard. She said that the Irish people were not only fond of music, but understood it—they were the best audiences and judges she ever sung to—their applause better timed and more judicious than that of other nations. She affords a fine example to unite *purity of mind* with beauty of person, and superiority of talent; but unfortunately it has been lost on her successors.

CHAPTER XI.

The Roman Catholic Proceedings in 1808.—Letters of Mr. Grattan thereon.—The Grant to the Catholic College of Maynooth reduced by the No-Popery administration.—Remarks thereon by Mr. Foster, Mr. Grattan, and Sir A. Wellesley (Secretary, afterwards Duke of Wellington).—The History of the Veto.—Efforts of Government to gain influence over the Catholic Church in 1782, 1795, 1799, 1806, and 1808.—The Object of Government.—Edmund Burke's opinions on this question.—Catholic Question brought forward by Mr. Grattan.—Dr. Milner's Commutation with Mr. Ponsonby.—Veto as stated by him.—Milner retracts.—People of Ireland oppose Veto.—Mr. Grattan's opinion thereon.—His Letter to Mr. M'Can.—Bank Question in 1809.—Sale of Writership and Seat in Parliament by Lord Castlereagh.—Mr. Grattan's conduct thereon.—History of that shameful transaction.—Public immorality and corruption.—Conduct of the Duke of York.—Investigation by the House of Commons.—Mrs. Clarke.—Mr. Grattan votes against the Duke, who is removed from the command of the Army.—Expedition to Walcheren.—Great loss experienced by the Army.—Subject of the Irish Union.—Mr. Grattan's Letters thereon.—Trade and Exports of Ireland.—Mr. Grattan's Letters to Messrs. M'Can and Berwick.

THE Roman Catholics assembled on the 19th of January in Dublin. Lord Fingall took the chair, and Count Dalton proposed that they should petition Parliament. Some individuals moved an adjournment, but the unanimity of the meeting was preserved by the exertions of Mr. O'Connell. The resolution was adopted, and the care of the petition entrusted to Lord Fingall; he offered it to the Duke of Portland, who declined to present it, and it was then entrusted to Lord Grenville.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

Brighton, January 25th, 1808.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—Don't forget to send me the *Evening Post*. Also tell me more particulars about the Catholic

meeting, and whether they think they have any chance, and whether they are encouraged in their hopes by any party in England. Send me, by some means or other, the book on Tithes.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MATTHEW O'CONNOR, ESQ.*

London, February 1st, 1808.

MY DEAR SIR,—In my two last letters I gave you my opinion regarding the Catholic petition. It now remains to assure you that this opinion is formed on mature consideration, and in conformity to that of others. I have no view in giving that opinion to throw anything off myself; on the contrary, if, when his Lordship comes over here and consults on the subject, if then my opinion shall be thought wrong, and it shall then be conceived advisable that I should present and move on the petition, I shall not decline the offer. I have always considered the Catholic question abstracted from any party or administration. Lord Hutchinson and I, and our old friend Mr. Forbes, were from the first agreed on the subject. When I conceived that it was unadvisable to petition in the late administration and in the present, it was because no change of administration could influence me in the question. However, the petition is voted, and it now remains to give it every support. Tell M'Can he never writes to me. What is he doing? Mention me to Mr. Forbes, with this observation, that a young lawyer who rises early is like the early bird who picks the corn. Remember me to Mrs. O'Connor, and believe me yours very truly,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, February 11th, 1808.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I got your letter of the 6th, and am to return you my thanks for your kindness.

I shall be very glad to hear from Lord Fingall, and shall, when he comes to England, wait on him immediately when I know where he is, to pay my respects to him. You will give his Lordship my compliments. I am glad my last letter, which was only a continuation of my first,

* This individual, in 1844, wrote the History of the Irish Brigade. It has been published since his death, and is an interesting memoir, and shows the ability and bravery of the Irish.

was agreeable to his Lordship. You may depend on it I shall never avoid any part serviceable to the Catholics.

How is Henry? There have been good debates, but not very many. Our friend Ponsonby acquitted himself excellently.* In the House of Lords, Lord Grey and Lord Moira spoke remarkably well. Lord Wellesley,† on the other side, was justly praised. We shall have a debate to-night in the Lords.‡—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

In the former session Mr. Foster stated it was the intention of Government only to grant the additional sum of 5,000*l.* for one year to the College of Maynooth; it had been originally intended for the education of 200 priests, for which purpose 8,000*l.* was voted by the Irish Parliament, and the additional sum had been granted by the late administration, for 200 students more and for new buildings that were in contemplation. To finish them the entire amount had been granted last year, and he now wished to add to the original sum, and make it 9,250*l.* Irish, to educate the 50 new students. Sir John Newport proposed 13,000*l.* Sir Arthur Wellesley (Duke of Wellington) objected to this: he stated that 2,000 priests was the number required in Ireland; that 111 were educated in different parts of Ireland, which, with 250 educated at Maynooth, made 361; a number sufficient for the supply. Sir John Newport observed, that prior to the French Revolution 478 students were educated on the continent, of which 420 received gratuitous education. A greater number would be required now, as the Catholic clergy amounted to near 3,000. Mr. Grattan

* Mr. Ponsonby's motion for papers respecting the Expedition to Copenhagen, on which occasion he delivered an admirable speech.

† He supported ministers on the question as to the right to seize the Danish fleet; he was an early friend of Mr. Grattan, and so continued to the last.

‡ On the dispute with America, and the mediation of Russia and Austria.

said that if provision was not made for the clergy at home, they would seek it abroad, and would bring back foreign connexions and foreign obligations; and while the spirit of Buonaparte pervaded the whole of the continent, that was not a time for keeping up the connexion. They would acquire political antipathies and Deistical principles; they would return religious Deists and political Catholics, to the great danger of overthrowing the Government. If the priests had any influence over the Catholics, they should be educated with sentiments of domestic attachment, not with those of our political enemies. He doubted whether the priests had as much absolute influence over the people as was supposed. If they wished the Catholics of Ireland to be well conducted, they should make their priests objects not of contempt, but of veneration. The Protestant religion would not be extended by demoralizing the Catholic clergy. On a division, the numbers for the larger grant were 38; for the lesser sum, 93.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, May 6th, 1808.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I am tired of London, where I shall be kept for a month. The debates of the House of Commons fatigue me. I take, however, little part in them, and when I do speak, the speeches don't appear; so that it makes little difference.

The Catholic question will come on in the course of this month: it will be well supported. Last night we had a second debate on the Maynooth business, in which Dr. Duigenan took an indiscreet part, and hurt the Catholics not at all.—Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

It had been for a long time an object of the British Government to obtain an influence over the Roman Catholic Church. Having failed to

put down that Church by persecution and penalty, they now strove, though in a lesser degree, to effect the object by art and intrigue. In 1782, they sought to interfere in the nomination of the Catholic bishops. From a letter of Mr. Burke, dated in February of that year, it appears that this plan was then in contemplation. In addressing a noble lord* on the subject of the penal laws against the Catholics, he says—"I heard of a scheme of giving to the Castle the patronage of the presiding members of the Catholic clergy. *At first I could scarcely credit it.* * * * *Never were the members of one religious sect fit to appoint the pastors of another.* Those who have no regard for their welfare, reputation, or internal quiet, will not appoint such as are proper. * * It is a great deal to suppose that even the present Castle† could nominate bishops for the Roman Church of Ireland with a religious regard for its welfare. Perhaps they cannot—perhaps they dare not do it. * * I do not say this as thinking the leading men in Ireland would exercise this trust worse than others; not at all. No men—no set of men—living are fit to administer the affairs, or to regulate the interior economy, of a Church to which they are enemies."

Such were the opinions of Mr. Burke. The plan to which he alludes was not proceeded with at that period; the times were not such as to allow even the public appearance of such a proposition. The vigilant champions of Ireland were then wide awake, and those who strove to rescue their country from the baleful interference of the British minister would not have suffered him to assume any such power. The people, too, who

* Burke's Works, edition of 1815, vol. vi. p. 290.

† Lord Carlile was then Lord Lieutenant, and Mr. Eden (afterwards Lord Auckland) was Secretary—a weak and powerless government.

were not ill prepared to deal with a corrupt minister—having at that time arms in their hands —would not have entered into any bargain such as was contemplated; for, though the Volunteers might not have understood the religious part of the question, it was not likely they would have assisted the minister, or that Mr. Grattan, who had introduced the resolutions at the Dungannon meeting in favour of religious toleration, would have agreed to add strength to the power he sought to shake, and give to the Crown more influence in the State, by assenting to a direct interference and influence over the Catholic prelacy and priesthood.

At such a moment, and with such men, the British minister was not likely to succeed even with the Catholic; and as to the Protestants, in a few months afterwards, when the Duke of Portland and Mr. Fox's party—that was friendly to Ireland—were in power, and prayed for time to enter into a negotiation with Lord Charlemont and Mr. Grattan on the subject of Ireland, these men, who led the popular movement, declined all parley with them, and rejected the offers proposed. There was no barter then as about the veto on the question of the Union, in 1799; there was no trafficking then as about the forty-shilling freeholders on the question of emancipation, in 1829. The leaders of the people then would not listen to any stipulations, or suffer any abatement of the rights of Ireland; they simply presented the claims of their country upon the bayonets of the Volunteers.

In some years afterwards, another opportunity presented itself for interfering with the Catholic Church, when another arrangement was about to be made with the Irish people. The project seems again to have been under consideration,

and it appeared to be upon the same principle as in 1782,—the mercantile spirit of barter and of sale. The Roman Catholics were in expectation of getting something, and it was expected that they would give up something. This was in the years 1794 — 95, in the matter of the colleges that were to be established for the education of the Catholic clergy. The letter of Dr. Hussey (Roman Catholic bishop) to Mr. Burke, in January 1795, and the reply of the latter, allude to the measure then in contemplation. Mr. Burke's words are remarkable:—"I wish very much to see before my death an image of a primitive Christian Church. With little improvements, I think the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland very capable of exhibiting that state of things. * * Re-baptism you won't allow; but truly it would not be amiss for the Christian Church to be re-christened. This is a great crisis for good or evil. *Above all, do not listen to any other mode of appointing your bishops than the present, whatever it is—no other elections than those you have—no Castle choices!*"

Those were Mr. Burke's sentiments, in which Mr. Grattan coincided. At that period he was in communication with Mr. Burke, and in habits of intimacy with Dr. Hussey, who showed him Mr. Burke's correspondence; and at the same time Mr. Burke was conferring with the Duke of Portland on the affairs of Ireland, on the subject of the Catholic colleges, and on the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, and was well aware what were the intentions of the Ministers. On the 17th of March, in the same year, he wrote to Dr. Hussey, and gave the Catholics what he calls "*his humble and respectful advice*—that they should not innovate, or permit others to innovate, upon any part of their ecclesiastical polity. That polity has been

preserved, and it has preserved them through the most dreadful storms that have perhaps shaken any Church for 250 years or upwards. *Let no consideration of a little money prevail on them to relinquish any part of it; for in the whole is their safety. I have heard of the election of priests to parishes, and bishops to dioceses, with an election by their enemies out of three candidates to be presented to their choice. My opinion is, that the old course—because it is the old course—should not in any instance be departed from by them.*

"If any aid be given to keep them in that course,—so advantageous to them and to public order,—good; but no extraneous interference of another religious system, to which they are to be subservient. Permit no elections from within or from without."

Such, after an interval of thirteen years, was again the confirmed opinion of Mr. Burke,—most remarkable when coming from so decided a supporter of royalty and all its prerogatives, and who at that period was strenuous in his efforts to preserve, if not to increase its power.

The affairs of Ireland having become embarrassed,—the Catholics having grown more discontented, in consequence of the disappointment as to the concession of their claims, and the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, in consequence of the intrigues of Mr. Pitt and the King, having convulsed the country, the plan so censured by Mr. Burke was not proceeded on; the project terminated simply in the erection of the College of Maynooth, and no interference with the nomination of the Catholic bishops was obtained for the Crown; the object, however, was still kept in view* and more effectual steps were taken, and a nearer approach

* See Lord Grenville's speech on moving the Catholic question in 1808.

to the purpose was effected in the year 1799; in that year, when every art and deceit, every promise and every fraud, every menace and every bribe was resorted to, it is not singular that some men should have been deceived, and have become the dupes of a dexterous and cunning minister.

In the hopes of obtaining from a British Parliament that which the Irish Parliament had so foolishly and so much to its cost refused (namely, their emancipation), four metropolitan and six diocesan Catholic bishops were induced, through the intrigues of Lord Castlereagh, to sign resolutions in favour of a royal veto in the appointment of their prelates.* This arrangement necessarily remained incomplete, as it depended on the passing of the Catholic measure, which it was not the intention of the Government to concede; Lord Castlereagh's object being then to cajole the clergy into a sanction of the principle in favour of the Crown, but not in any way to carry the measure in favour of the Catholics—his cunning was discreditable, but successful. The question of Union, and the loss of the Irish Legislature, absorbed every other consideration and filled every man's mind, so that the matter passed over, though not without severe animadversions on the Catholic prelates who had acted such an ignoble part in the hour of national danger and distress.

The question was again revived in some degree in 1807, as appears from the Duke of Bedford's letter to Mr. Grattan, at page 331; this, too, expired with the Whig ministry of that day, but it was destined to be revived under the auspices of an English ecclesiastic (Dr. Milner).

Accordingly, the Catholic question was brought

* See Lord Grenville's Letter to Lord Fingall in 1810; see Sir John Hippesley's Letters on the Catholic Claims, to Lord Fingall; see also Maurice Fitzgerald's (Knight of Kerry) pamphlet alluding to these transactions, published 1845.

forward in May 1808, under the following circumstances. Lord Fingall had been entrusted with the care of the petition, and had made private application to Mr. Ponsonby; he stated to him that the Catholic Bishops had made a proposal to the Irish Government in 1799; that they entertained the same opinions now as they did then; that they had an agent in London (Dr. Milner) who would call on Mr. Ponsonby on the subject. Accordingly, this person had communication, by letter, with him,* and detailed the sentiments of the

* In the debate on this question in 1810, Mr. Ponsonby stated the proceedings regarding Dr. Milner, and produced the letter and ticket he then left at his house; as follows:—

On one side of the ticket was written "Dr. Milner, Bloomsbury," and on the other these remarks:—

1. Protestant Succession. Clause in Oath of Defence Bill.
2. Attending Established Service.
Service by Articles of War.
3. Catholic Catechism—Thomas Paine's Works.
4. Nomination to Catholic Prelacies.

The letter was in the following words:—

"Dr. Milner presents his respectful compliments to the Right Hon. Mr. Ponsonby, and takes the liberty of stating, distinctly in writing, the substance of what he did say, or meant to say, in the conversation, which he had the honour of holding with Mr. Ponsonby. First, the Catholic Prelates of Ireland are willing to give a *direct negative power* to his Majesty's Government, with respect to the nomination of their titular bishoprics, in such manner that, when they have among themselves resolved who is the fittest person for the vacant see, they will transmit his name to his Majesty's Ministers, and, if the latter should object to that name, they will transmit another and another, until a name is presented to which no objection is made; and (which is never likely to be the case) should the Pope refuse to give those essentially necessary spiritual powers, of which he is the depositary, to the person so presented by the Catholic Bishops, and so approved of by Government, they will continue to present the names until one occurs which is agreeable to both parties, namely, the Crown and the Apostolic See. It is to be observed, however,—1. That the Crown does not interfere with the concerns of any other religious sect or church which it does not support. 2. That the nominators in this business, namely, *the Catholic Bishops, have universally sworn allegiance to his Majesty.* 3. That they will, moreover, engage to nominate no person who had not taken the oath in question.

"2ndly. It appears that the clause concerning the *Protestant Succession* does not occur in the oath of the Defence Bill; but it would be highly gratifying to the consciences of the Catholic bishops and clergy,

Catholics as to the appointment of their Bishops. This was, in general terms, imparted to Mr. Grattan, who, on the 25th of May, moved that their petition should be referred to a Committee of the whole House. He stated, "that he had a proposition which the Catholics had authorized him to make, and it is this, that in the future nomination of Bishops, his Majesty might interfere and exercise his royal privilege, and that no Catholic Bishop shall be appointed without the entire approbation of his Majesty." Mr. Grattan entered no further into the subject, and in these general terms only communicated what he had been authorized to say; but Ponsonby went further, and said that he made the statement on the authority of Dr. Milner, who was a Catholic Bishop in this country, and who was authorized by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland to make this proposition in case of their emancipation being conceded. This proposition was, that when the

and a great proportion of the laity (should an opportunity occur), if any friend of theirs would distinctly state, in *what sense they understood* that clause in the oath appointed for them to take, particularly in that of 1791, viz. *as a penalty* which must for ever remain upon them, and to which *they submit with all humility, not as* an engagement which they take upon themselves in such sort that they would *be obliged to take no arms against his Majesty if he were to go to mass.* They conceive themselves justified in understanding the clause in this sense, by the most positive assurances that such was the meaning of the legislature, which were given them in 1791 by Bishop Horsley, and other distinguished senators, who managed the bill in Parliament.

"3rdly. The practice of forcing Catholic soldiers and sailors to attend the established service of the Church of England, and everywhere else, except in Ireland, is a religious grievance and oppression, which is deeply felt by all Catholics, particularly by the subjects of this intolerance.

"4thly. Mr. Ponsonby was so good as to say, that he would disclaim, in the name of the Catholics of Ireland, the civil and religious code of Thomas Paine, which they have been accused, in the newspapers at least, of teaching and holding.

"Dr. Milner has not, of course, had an opportunity yet of consulting with the Catholic prelates of Ireland on the important subject of the Catholic presentations; but *he has every reason to believe*, that they will cheerfully subscribe to the plan traced out in the first page of this note.

11, *Queen Street, Bloomsbury Square.*

Prelates had resolved on the person to be nominated to a vacant bishopric, his name should be submitted for the King's approbation. If that was refused, another person should be proposed, and so on in succession, until his Majesty's approbation should be obtained, so that the appointment should finally rest with the King. This excited considerable sensation amongst the English members, but Mr. Perceval, who was averse to all concession, opposed it, as he did not think it would content or conciliate the Irish, and added, rather whimsically, "that he did not conceive himself precluded from supporting the Catholic claims under different circumstances; for instance, if a change took place in the Catholic religion itself!" On a division, the numbers were, 128 for Mr. Grattan's motion, 281 against it—a majority of 153.* In the House of Lords, Lord Grenville made a similar motion to that of Mr. Grattan—spoke more decidedly on the question of the veto, and stated that his ideas and those of Mr. Pitt had been similar in the year 1799.

Dr. Milner, the day after the debate, published a protest against the use his name had been made of, the preceding evening, on the subject of the veto. This aggravated the case, opened the door to controversy and recrimination, which lasted for a number of years, and greatly injured the Catholic cause. With what feelings of propriety or justice Dr. Milner could adopt the course he did, it is difficult to imagine, when the letter and instructions given by him to Mr. Ponsonby are considered; he seems to have made an unaccountable

* Nine counties had forwarded petitions from the Protestant inhabitants in favour of the Catholic claims; and a letter from Mr. Plunket (the late Attorney-General) was read by Mr. Ponsonby, which stated, "There is nothing new in this country, *excepting*, I believe I speak within bounds when I say that nine in ten Protestants, even including the clergy, would poll for Catholic emancipation."

mistake, and certainly did the Catholics great injury.

In the month of September, the Catholic Prelates met in Dublin, and resolved, "that it was their decided opinion that it was inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of the Roman Catholic Bishops, which mode long experience has proved to be unexceptionable, wise, and salutary." They followed this by another resolution, pledging themselves only to recommend such persons as were of unimpeachable loyalty and peaceable conduct. This was signed by twenty-three Bishops; there were only three dissentients, namely those prelates who signed the resolutions of 1799. For this proceeding they received the thanks of the Catholics at several meetings in various parts of Ireland,—for the laity now took a very decided part against the veto,—but the result was, that the question remained in abeyance during 1809, and suffered considerably in the opinion of the people of both countries.

On this intricate subject Mr. Grattan had been very cautious, and acted a judicious part. He only stated what he had been commissioned to say on their behalf, but his opinion was, that the veto was a bad measure; and, in his mind, it was a great question whether it would not be injurious to liberty to admit the Catholics, and give such power to the Crown,—he thought it would add to the physical strength of the Empire, but, that like other churches, theirs would be venal. "*I own I tremble*," were his words. The fact was, Mr. Grattan was afraid of Buonaparte. He considered that Ireland was in danger of being lost, and that, between the power of France and the exasperating bigotry of the British minister, it would be next to impossible to induce the great body of the

people of Ireland to adhere to the connection; this caused him to submit the proposition to Parliament, otherwise he would have refused to communicate to that body the proposition from Dr. Milner and the Catholic Prelates, just as steadfastly as he had refused to present their petition and urge their claims in Parliament the year before, when he conceived it injurious and imprudent. He said that whatever would be done, nothing would take place without an addition of power to the Crown, and he even foresaw and foretold the attack that was afterwards made on the forty-shilling freeholders on passing the Emancipation Act.

In 1799 the Catholic Prelates had not only made a tender of the measure, but had gone further; for an inquiry was then instituted into the value of every living held by the priests, and a return was made to the Government, and it was not then considered incompatible with their religion, to grant a veto to the Crown. However, he did not urge the point much in his speech, and was brief and reserved on the subject. Mr. Ponsonby was less so, and Lord Grenville went at great length into the subject, and stated that the veto was part of the system in contemplation at the Union, and that on this subject Mr. Pitt's ideas and opinions were the same. From hence arose a controversy that lasted several years,—the English party were dissatisfied at Dr. Milner's conduct,—some of the Irish party took his part,—their clergy and laity protested against the veto, and the question got more embroiled than ever.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, 13th May, 1808.

MY DEAR M'CAN.—I have learned of poor Lady Tyrawly's* death, and was much shocked. I had a regard

* She was cousin to Mr. Grattan, daughter of his aunt (Mrs. Levinge) who was the daughter of Chief Justice Marlay.

for her, and had obligations to her. I shall see you soon. We have had some curious debates of late: one on the subject of Doctor Duigenan, who spoke against the Catholics on the Maynooth question, with his usual vehemence; that, and his other conduct regarding them, gave cause for a motion against his advancement to the Council.

I did not speak against him—nor vote—as he had been my enemy I would not be his judge. There is nothing new here.—Yours most truly,

H. G.

SAME TO SAME.

London, May 27th, 1808.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I was half awake when I wrote yesterday. Our Catholic question went off favourably, I think for the Catholics. There was no violent sentiment against them, and a very strong sentiment for them; all the opposition almost spoke for them, and ably. Ponsonby was remarkably well; he answered Mr. Wilberforce, and attacked Mr. Perceval, who spoke with less violence than was apprehended, and argued with temper.

I received more praise for what I said than I deserved; one half had the languor of old age, and wanted fire and rapidity. However, the Catholic cause is rather served on the whole.—Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

SAME TO SAME.

London, June 4th, 1808.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I got your letters. I am glad the Catholic proceedings have given satisfaction. I was anxious about the event, as I always shall be, till the Catholics obtain their object. Their case is not unpopular in the House of Commons, as you will see by the debates, and their great enemies said nothing on the question. On the Bank Charter* we were within thirteen of the ministry in

* On Lord Henry Petty's (Lansdowne) motion on the Bank of Ireland Bill, to enable Catholics to be chosen Governors or Directors. The charter had been granted in 1782, but even at that bright period, the dawn of religious liberty only appeared, and the spirit of the age was not sufficiently liberal to remove the penal code; but in 1793, when the relaxing statute passed, it was intended to have admitted Catholics; unfortunately, by the omission of a single word in the act, they were

favour of the Catholics. The debate is to be published here—I must revise my part of it—it will then go to Ireland; this will be better than a separate publication. The case of the late officers of the Paving Board is a hard one—but to get them compensation from the public would be too strong a measure—it is for that reason the ministry does not move it.—Believe me, yours ever, and most truly,

H. GRATTAN.

Ponsonby spoke remarkably well on the Catholic question.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

June 20th, 1808.

MY DEAR BERWICK,—I am sorry you are leaving Ireland, because I am going to it, and I lose some pleasant days which I should have spent with you.

I go to Worthing on Wednesday, return in a few days, and then proceed with the boys to Ireland, where we shall stay for about two months; a vagabond life, but it is so ordered by a concurrence of accidents.

I find the Bishop of Llandaff* has, in the republication of his charge, prefixed an advertisement, in which he signifies his sense of the propriety of acceding to the Catholic measure. This, added to the speech of the Bishop of Norwich,† will do service. I was shocked at Lady Tyrawly's death. I am harassed by preparing to go into the country, paying bills, &c. &c., disagreeable, ungrateful, unprofitable.

The Catholic debate will be published immediately—it

held to be excluded; and on this occasion the Imperial Parliament was in vain appealed to, in order to carry into effect the intention of the Irish; on a division, the number for admitting the Catholics was 83, against them 96.

* Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, delivered his pastoral charge to his clergy in June, 1805, after the discussion of the Catholic question; it was friendly to toleration, but was not then published. But in 1808, as the situation of the country grew more critical, it appeared with a preface, stating his approbation of the measure (of emancipation), "as calculated to support the independence of the country, to secure the stability of the throne, to promote peace among fellow-subjects and charity among fellow-christian, and in no probable degree dangerous to the constitution either in church or state." See his letters to the minister on this subject, published among "His Anecdotes," by his Son. Ed. 1814.

† Bathurst—another liberal and enlightened individual who voted and spoke for the Catholics. The first speech he ever made in Parliament.

gives me great pleasure what you told me in your letter on that subject. I was very anxious about the question, and think it advanced. I long to talk to you on that, and, indeed, other subjects, but shall not have an opportunity for many years, I suppose, for you coming to England when I go to Ireland, and I returning from Ireland when you leave England, per consequence we cannot meet except like highwaymen—on the road.

Dr. Baillie has just left me, he says Mrs. Grattan is in no danger, that she will recover so far to be at her ease, and, perhaps, to walk on flat ground*—even this is consolation,

Remember me to Mrs. B. and the children, particularly my grandchild.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

The public affairs in 1809, in which Mr. Grattan took part, were the questions as to the British Orders in Council, which had been passed in consequence of the Berlin and Milan Decrees of Buonaparte, declaring certain ports to be in a state of blockade, and by which the trade between Great Britain and America had been considerably injured. On this subject Mr. Whitbread moved an address to his Majesty for conciliatory negotiations with America; in this he was warmly supported by Mr. Grattan, who stated that England had, by her impolicy, lost the affections of America, and that, if she persevered in such conduct, she would drive America into the arms of France.

Another question in which Mr. Grattan took part, was one that regarded Lord Castlereagh. It appeared from the evidence given before a Committee on East Indian abuses, that he had given a writership to his friend Lord Clancarty to dispose of, in order to purchase a seat in the House of Commons. Whether he had introduced these corrupt practices from Ireland, where he

* She never recovered the use of her limbs, and for twenty years was unable to move from her chair.

had employed them before so successfully for his object, or whether he found them indigenous in the soil to which he had transplanted the remains of the Irish Parliament, it is not necessary to inquire—(the latter was the most likely)—but upon the discovery, a motion was made by Lord Archibald Hamilton, condemning the transaction, and resolving, "that Lord Castlereagh, as President of the Board of Control, as Privy Councillor and Secretary of State, had been guilty of a violation of duty, and of an attack on the purity and Constitution of Parliament." Mr. Canning moved a singular amendment, by no means complimentary to his colleague, namely, "that, considering the intention referred to in the evidence was not carried into effect, the House did not think it necessary to come to a criminatory resolution."

On this occasion Mr. Grattan spoke, and it was thought that he would, on such a subject as the sale of seats in Parliament, have duly remembered the conduct of Lord Castlereagh in Ireland, and have exhibited, in their proper colours, the corrupt practices that had there been pursued. The occasion would not have been passed over by a less noble-minded or a younger man, and justice almost demanded that it should be made a day of public trial and retribution.

To the surprise of many, and the disappointment of some (for the House of Commons is not averse to a smart political wrangle), Mr. Grattan adopted a milder course, and though he condemned the offence, he was lenient towards the offender. He observed that, as the noble Lord was on his trial, and the House was bound to go through the trial with "judicial temper, rather than with any spirit of prosecutionary violence, and it was upon this principle that he could not approve of going back to the political proceedings

in which the noble Lord had such a share in effecting the measure of Union with Ireland. He could hardly think it fair to charge him upon one issue, and to try him on another; but as the noble Lord had confessed his crime, he did not think the House could refuse to affix to such a transaction the deserved reprobation." For the resolution there were 167, and against it 216; Mr. Canning's amendment passed afterwards by 47 majority.

On this occasion it must be admitted that Mr. Grattan displayed great generosity, the crime of this individual being precisely that by which he had done such mischief to his country, and destroyed the constitution that Mr. Grattan had so great a share in obtaining; such conduct was certainly little deserved by Lord Castlereagh, however noble on the part of Mr. Grattan—it was well received by the House, and by Lord Castlereagh with strong sentiments of gratitude and obligation, which he took occasion subsequently to express; but the insidious friendship of his colleague, Canning, was never forgotten.

The mode of managing these frauds is at once singular and sagacious, and seems to have been so well arranged that the practice must have been reduced to system at least if we are to judge from the expertness of the parties. It appeared that Lord Clancarty (Trench) wanted to get into the House of Commons, and finding that he could get money for the sale of an office, he applied to Lord Castlereagh to get a writership to sell to a person of the name of Ogg, who was to give 3,500*l.* for it, which was to be given to Lord Sligo for a seat in Parliament for Lord Clancarty; out of this 3,500*l.*, 5*l.* per cent. was to be paid as commission to two agents in the business, and a loan of money was promised to a Mrs. Groves,

In this matter the parties stood thus:—

Lord Castlereagh did not know Ogg, Lord Clancarty did not know Ogg, Lord Sligo did not know Ogg; but Ogg was to get the writership, Sligo was to get the money, and Clancarty was to get the seat.

As President of the Board of Control, Lord Castlereagh had sworn "*not to bargain or be privy to any bargain for civil situations in India;*" yet one lord was to sell a seat for money, and another lord a writership for a seat; thus a seat was to be sold which should not be sold, and an office was to be bought which should not be bought, and an oath was to be broken which should have been inviolate. It was perjury—complicated iniquity—violation of law and constitution; yet it occasioned little noise—little surprise—no indignation. The traffic in eastern corruption, and its gains, had so habituated and hardened the mind of both Parliament and people, that no shame was manifested—no remorse felt*—no punishment inflicted. Such was the sickly state of the moral age, and so deteriorated its principle,—the melancholy consequence of too much power and too much wealth, and the approaching symptoms of a declining state.

The proceeding, however, injured Lord Castlereagh; but strange to say, he suffered more from his so-called friend Mr. Canning, than from his former opponent Mr. Grattan. He never forgot the forbearance of the latter, nor the enmity of the

* Demosthenes in his celebrated third Phillippic, compares the pristine virtue of the Athenians with their subsequent baseness; in the former he particularises their abhorrence of bribes—

χρηματα λαμβανοντας απαντες εμισων, και χαλεπωτατον ην το δωροδοκουντα εξελεγχθηναι, και τιμωρία μεγιστη τουτον εκολασον, και παραιτησας αδεμια ην, ουδε συγγνωμη.

In their state of degradation he says of those who took money.

ζηλος ει τις ειληφε τι, γελως αν ομολογη, συγγνωμη τοις ελεγχομενοις, μισος αι τουτοις τις επιτημα, ταλλα παντα οσα εκ του δωροδοκειν ηρτηται.

former. Canning declared he would no longer remain in office with him, but was persuaded by the Duke of Portland to continue in for a short time; and (shame to say) during this period Lord Castlereagh was allowed to direct the expedition to Walcheren. Such are the angry and dangerous tides in politics that waft empires and armies to their disgrace and ruin. After the melancholy failure of this immense armament, his colleague declared him to be incompetent, as well as unworthy, and a breach and a duel were the result.

The other questions in which Mr. Grattan took part in the Session of 1809, were the motion of Sir Henry Parnell to relieve the people of Ireland from the oppressive mode of paying tithe, and the bill of Mr. Curwen to improve the representation of the people in Parliament: both of which he supported, and neither of which was carried. But the subject that rivetted the attention of the people of England, was the proceeding by the House of Commons regarding the Duke of York. Mr. Wardle had brought forward charges against him as Commander-in-chief, for suffering commissions to be disposed of through the influence of a favourite, Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke, the wife of a tradesman, with whom he had been connected for a few years. Prior to any step, *the minister had privately asked him if such statements could possibly be well founded. The Duke replied they were not true,* and the minister unfortunately believed him. This folly of Mr. Perceval cost him dear. He agreed to an inquiry. A committee of the whole House was appointed, the lady was examined at the bar, and a most disgraceful scene took place. Disclosures the most unbecoming were made—proceedings the most undignified were revealed—alike destructive of the Duke's character as a man of honour, of sense and of

morality. The case was not made out as fully as Mr. Wardle expected, but enough was proved to show great weakness on the part of the Duke; and two of his letters* to this lady discovered the influence she possessed over him, which, if exerted, might very probably have greatly biassed his conduct. Promotions were paid for—she had interfered, and had received the money. The personal appearance of this individual was pleasing.† Her features were fair and pretty — her figure graceful, but small, her manner easy and genteel, and her voice soft and persuasive: truth, candour, and artlessness were cleverly assumed, and, with every semblance of nature—in short, she acted her part to admiration; and the House was prepossessed in her favour, particularly when, on one occasion, she was somewhat rudely cross-examined.‡ The attendance of the members was numerous—the old looked gay and smirking—the young were joyous and joking —the witness was calm and collected: she smiled at Mr. Wilberforce, was facetious with the Speaker, severe on Mr. Croker,§ and civil and formal to the Serjeant-at-arms. In fine, this grave assembly seemed somewhat amused, though certainly lowered, by the undignified and ribald exhibition. Never was a play better acted on any stage. The Duke was acquitted by the House, and pronounced guilty by the people.

The particulars were as follows:—

In the month of January Mr. Wardle brought

* Vol. xii. Parliamentary Debates, Appendix.

† The author sat beneath the gallery during the inquiry, it being the privilege of a member to bring in his son.

‡ Mr. Croker desired that "*the woman*" should answer the question. The House recoiled at his ungentlemanlike manner and expression.

§ She ridiculed his provincial dialect, particularly his pronunciation of the word *person*, that he called *parson*; and alluded to his spying her proceedings from a garret window in an opposite house. It led, however, to his elevation to the Secretaryship of the Admiralty.

forward his motion, and stated a number of cases to prove the corrupt practices in the disposal of offices and commissions in the army. These he supported by several witnesses, the principal of whom was Mrs. Clarke, and the officers immediately concerned. The committee consumed six weeks in examining evidence, and one week in debating it. Pending these proceedings, the Duke of York, on the 23rd of February, addressed a letter to the Speaker, stating that he had waited with anxiety till the committee had closed this inquiry; he observed his name coupled with transactions the most criminal and disgraceful; that he regretted and lamented a connection should have existed, that exposed his character and honour to public animadversion. As to the offences alleged, he, in the most solemn manner —*upon his honour as a Prince*—asserted his innocence, not only by denying any corrupt participation in the infamous transactions, or connivance at their existence, but also the slightest knowledge or suspicion* that they existed at all.

He hoped that the House would not, on such evidence, adopt any proceeding prejudicial to his honour and character; but if they thought his innocence questionable, he claimed not to be condemned without trial, or to be deprived of the benefit and protection afforded to every British subject, by those sanctions on which alone evidence is received in the administration of the law.

This letter was manifestly intended to cover his retreat, and was thus prepared by the minister. But it was unwise — untrue — unconstitutional; and was so considered by Mr. Whitbread, Lord Henry Petty, and other members, who declared it to be a gross attack on the privileges of the House. It was, however, passed over—probably through

* She spent five thousand a year, the Duke only allowed her one.

commiseration. On the 6th March, Mr. Wardle proposed an address to the King, stating that the existence of corrupt practices and abuses were true, and could not have continued without the knowledge of the Commander-in-chief, and that he ought, therefore, to be deprived of the command of the army. By way of amendment, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Perceval, then moved two resolutions, declaring that there was no ground for the charges against his Royal Highness, nor any connection with the corrupt practices disclosed. These resolutions were to be followed up by an address to the King, expressing the regret of the House that such a connection should have existed, whereby criminal and disgraceful transactions were carried on, and the integrity of his Royal Highness's conduct brought into question, but that it was a consolation to observe the regret he had expressed on the subject of that connection, and the House trusted that he would keep in view the bright example of virtuous conduct which his Majesty has afforded to his subjects.

On the 10th March, Mr. Bankes moved as an amendment, an address to his Majesty, stating that such corrupt practices and abuses did exist; that there was no ground to charge his Royal Highness with personal corruption or participation in any of the profits derived by such undue means, but that such abuses could scarcely have existed without exciting the suspicion of the Commander-in-chief, and that the House submitted to his Majesty, whether the command of the army ought any longer to remain in his hands; that the abuses unveiled a course of conduct of the worst example to public morals, and highly injurious to the cause of religion, which, if not discountenanced by his Majesty and the House, cannot fail to have a pernicious effect on the main-springs of social order

and well-regulated society, which it was his Majesty's care to strengthen by his counsels, and illustrate by his example.

On the 13th March, Sir Thomas Turton moved his amendment, that there was ground for charging his Royal Highness of having a knowledge that there were corrupt practices. These various propositions were debated at great length, until the 17th March, when the division took place, the numbers being, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer's address 278, and against it 196, being a majority of 82 in favour of the Duke. On this question Mr. Grattan voted against his Royal Highness. The next day the Duke sent in his resignation to his Majesty. The other divisions are worth noticing, as they show the spirit of the times and the disposition of the representatives. The division on the 8th March, which was to substitute the amendment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer instead of Mr. Wardle's motion for an address, was, for Mr. Wardle's motion 123; for Mr. Perceval's amendment 364; for Mr. Bankes' amendment 199, and against it 294; for Sir Thomas Turton's amendment 135, against it 334, —so careful were they in avoiding to charge the Duke with connivance or participation. At length, on the 20th March, Lord Althorpe moved, that as the Duke had resigned, the House did not *now* think it necessary to proceed with the evidence. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had stated that, as the House had proved his innocence, the Duke could now fairly tender his resignation to his Majesty, proposed the omission of the word "*now*," which was carried by 235 to 112.

Thus ended these disgraceful proceedings. The nation was scandalized and indignant—society was outraged and insulted—private morals were deeply wounded—and the royal family was lowered in

the esteem of the people, who looked upon them as *the patrons of profligacy*. The extravagance—the excesses—the wantonness of the Prince in his youth, and the criminal conduct of the Duke in his age, became the subject of general condemnation. Every rude hand unsparingly assisted to tear aside the veil that covered their private deformities, and to expose them beneath the public gaze with a joyful malignity. One alone was spared,—the King was the only individual who escaped. The people felt for his grey hairs and his infirmities—they condoled with him in his calamity, and in the anguish he sustained for the disgrace of the son whom he most loved, and they forgot for a moment the political errors of his reign in the private misfortunes of his family.

During these events—which a wise minister should have risked every hazard to avoid—there impended over the country another calamity, of a different nature, which fell upon her with unwonted severity. England had failed in most of her expeditions, and her ministers now prepared one that was to add the climax to all their former mismanagement, and to eclipse every one of her past misfortunes. The King had objected to the appointment of Sir Arthur Wellesley to the command of the expedition to Portugal, on the ground that he was too young and inexperienced; the minister, however, overruled him. But when another expedition was planned he insisted on having, as he termed it, "*his own commander;*" and the recollection and love he bore to Mr. Pitt led him, unfortunately, to select from that family the Earl of Chatham.* Austria—who would not march a single soldier without a subsidy from

* The narrative that he handed to his Majesty, unknown to his brother officers and the members of the cabinet, showed how he conceived himself privileged to exert that influence which had so long

England—had urged the British Cabinet to make a diversion in Holland in her favour; and some riots among the artisans and workmen in the Dutch towns having occurred, they were represented as indicating a spirit of hostility to Buonaparte's government, which should be quickly made use of. These were, however, quelled before the expedition proceeded. It was the most formidable that had ever quitted the shores of Great Britain. The object, as stated by Lord Castlereagh, was to make a diversion in favour of Austria; and the instructions to Lord Chatham were to destroy the naval establishments of Flushing and Antwerp, and render the Scheldt no longer navigable for ships of war.

The armament consisted of thirty-seven sail of the line, twenty-four frigates, two vessels of fifty guns, three of forty-four; thirty-one sloops, five bomb-vessels, twenty-three gun-brigs, thirty-nine thousand troops, and seven lieutenant-generals. They departed on the 28th of July; and on the 23rd of December the remains of the army returned, after evacuating the island of Walcheren. It appeared by the return that sixty officers and three thousand nine hundred men, exclusive of those killed by the enemy, had died before the 1st of February, 1810; and on that day two hundred and seventeen officers and eleven thousand two hundred and ninety-six men were reported sick.* The delay before Flushing was such that the

possessed a charm in the mind of the King. His conduct was severely censured by Mr. Whitbread and other members of the House of Commons.—*Par. Debates*, vol. xvi. pp. 6, 9, 10, 11, 17.

* The author got the following account from the physician (Dr. Nolson) who attended his brother when attacked by fever. He was on the walls when the British first appeared before Flushing. Some infantry approached the gate where he stood, and fired at the French. The sentries tried in vain to draw up the bridge and let fall the gates—the chains were broken or out of order. The inhabitants fled from the walls, crying out that the town was taken, and Nolson fled with them.

French had time to arm every post; and all attempts on the fleet and arsenals were declared, by the unanimous opinion of all the lieutenant-generals on the 27th of August, to be impracticable, and were of necessity abandoned; notwithstanding which the Ministers, as if to give a pretence for the expedition, retained possession of this unwholesome island for a period nearly of four months. In these insular parts of Holland there exists a periodical fever and ague,* that begins in August and ends in November, most dangerous in its nature, and generally fatal in its consequence, leaving behind seeds of a most painful disorder, which often affects the sufferer for the remainder of his days.

At this unprecedented calamity, and the disgrace and loss consequent thereon, the people were justly dissatisfied, and called for inquiry; but the King, who had privately received a narrative of the events from Lord Chatham, was averse to any, and in his answer to the city of London, stated that he did not think it necessary to institute one; but on the 26th of January, 1810, the House of Commons agreed to a motion of Lord Porchester's, for the appointment of a committee of the whole House to inquire into the policy and conduct of the expedition to the Scheldt. It was carried only by a majority of nine; the numbers being 195 to 186. The committee and examination of witnesses lasted till the

In a grove, at some distance, there was a party of cavalry, and if they had advanced, all could have entered and held the gate till reinforcements had arrived. But, to the surprise of the French, the signal to retire was sounded, and the British retreated. The French then got a piece of artillery on the walls, and killed several of our men. Baron de Rottenburgh was the officer who ordered them to retreat; thus the town was lost and thousands of lives were sacrificed. Such are the chances in military operations.

* When Colonel Pack's regiment (the 71st) ordered arms after marching into Middleburg, the author saw a number of the men fall from the ranks struck with the fever and ague.

30th of March. "Resolutions were then proposed, which condemned the advisers of so ill-judged an enterprise; but they were lost by a majority of 48; 275 voting to acquit the Ministers and 227 against them. Mr. Grattan, who had supported the inquiry, spoke and voted for these resolutions, and concluded by saying that the House had lately censured Lord Chatham for an attempt to set aside the responsibility of ministers, let it then take care that its conduct, on this occasion, does not tend to establish their impunity." This was exactly what occurred.

On Lord Castlereagh the blame had chiefly fallen, he had been the actor and adviser of this national calamity; fostered, transplanted, and promoted by England, he had now repaid the obligation, and employed as the author of ruin in one country, he proved the instrument of defeat and disgrace in the other. Mr. Perceval stoutly defended him, and partook in the labours of the defence as he had in the undertaking. Mr. Canning professed to share the blame, and justified the measure and conduct of Lord Castlereagh, although he was the person, who, in April preceding, had gone to the Duke of Portland to complain of his colleague, and declared that the noble lord was not fit for his office, and was incompetent to the situation, notwithstanding which, he allowed him to direct the expedition—and when it failed he justified him—and, when he came to speak on it, he offered, for such conduct, no apology.* Ministers, however, were not satisfied with this vote of acquittal—they required more—they asked for approbation, and, accordingly,

* He was severely reproved for this by Mr. Whitbread. The truth was, that the quarrel was a mere contest for place. Both of the parties lost office, but Lord Castlereagh showed more dexterity; for he had the address, not only to get back into power, but to get into Mr. Canning's situation,—the Secretaryship for Foreign Affairs.

General Crauford proposed a resolution declaring that the House approved of the retention of the Island of Walcheren, and this horrid and criminal vote was carried by 255 to 232. Thus, the people were made the victims of their virtuous feelings, and were taught that the wiser course would have been, to have remained silent and indifferent, and to have allowed the calamities of the nation to pass by unheeded and unlamented, for, when they asked for a vote of censure, Parliament answered them by a vote of approbation. That vote, however, decided the fate of the House of Commons, it sealed its doom and sunk its character, and the assembly never after rose in the esteem of the people. By this vote, as well as the one on the Duke of York's affair, it had proclaimed itself a miserable body—insensible to the wrongs of the country—excusing its disasters—rejoicing at its degradation — incapable of feeling what everybody else felt, and making the last sad grievance of the country—the Parliament. At this period they were on the eve of a war with America, at war with Russia, and at war with every nation in Europe, except Sweden, and with a public debt of eight hundred millions. One thing, however, was wanting to proclaim to mankind their folly, their ignorance, and their baseness, greater than either; to complete their losses, and put the sum to their disgrace, nothing but a jubilee was wanting, and public rejoicing at the fiftieth anniversary of a reign of debt, defeat, and disgrace—a reign of temerity, cupidity, and incapacity—this strange phenomenon occurred, and mankind heard with astonishment, the day of England's thanksgiving.

The secret was, that the King had become everything; the power of the Crown had so increased, that its influence pervaded every part of the constitution,—the mere disbursement of fifty

millions of annual expenditure was of itself sufficient to taint and corrupt the nation. In the former war, the Crown had been weakened, and at the end of the American contest the King must have compromised, for he was defeated, and would have yielded if the opposition had stood firm; but he saved himself by the coalition he made with Mr. Pitt. The result of the present war was different, it made the Crown everything, and gave to the King the two Houses of Parliament. Thus he gained a victory over the constitution, and realized the saying of Lord Thurlow, "that if the King stood at the back of any minister, that minister would have the House of Commons;" fortunately George III. was not a military man, otherwise he might have become absolute, for the public would not have stood by the House of Commons—that was no longer the standard round which they would have rallied — it had degenerated and become a court aristocracy, and was merely an instrument in the hands of the King, and the public would not have risen against the King, who had made the Parliament his instrument, but against the instrument itself. In fine, this was not a natural or a gradual decline, but a radical and staminal depravity in the principle of government, and which could only be cured or corrected by reform, and such was the opinion of Mr. Grattan, as will appear from his letter on the subject of reform.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

April 3rd, 1809.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I got your letter, and thank you. What you mention regarding Hartley frightens me. I hope, however, he is quite recovered. I have brought in the Debtors' Bill; it has been once read, and an order has been made to print it. I hope it may pass; it is nearly the same as that which passed some years ago.

We have a vacation for twelve days; of which I am glad, as the House tires me much. I don't think we shall have a great deal to do after the recess. I find the new Paving Bill excites discontent, at least in some individuals; I presented two petitions against it. The removal of the Duke of York was a necessary measure.

The minority was so large, and the people so offended, that he could not have continued at the head of the army. I intended to have spoken, but missed the opportunity; and when the close came on, there were so many who wished to speak, that I did not like to force myself on the House, already inattentive. I voted against him.—Yours truly,

H. G.

SAME TO SAME.

London, 11th April, 1809.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I thank you for your letter. I hope you find your time now your own, and that you will accomplish your great designs with respect to your sea-farm.* As your house is moored in the strand, you ought to have a boat in your parlour, for the accommodation of your friends if you should be surprised by the tide.

I got your second letter this moment regarding M'Dermot; but there will be no individual specified in the insolvents. Such a list would not be admitted: however, if admitted, he shall (as far as can be with propriety) be attended to. The bill is to be read a second time to-day. How are all our friends? How is Hartley? as he was not very well when you wrote to me some time ago. Henry says you don't write to him. How is Forbes? has he gotten a bag? does he attend the Courts constantly? does he rise betimes, or is he in bed at ten as usual? I don't hear any news, except that which you must know already, and which is not good. The citizens have no right to be offended with me; if they are I cannot help it.—Ever yours,

H. G.

SAME TO SAME.

Eastbourne, October 5th, 1809.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I mentioned in my letter that the

* His place at Sandymount was invaded by the sea at high tides.

boys were returned:* one of them ill; but now well. I was uneasy about them, and with reason.

You see in the paper the offer to the Opposition,† and the changes in the Ministry. How far, or how long, the Ministry as now constituted will be able to go on, 'tis not easy to say; but I should think it will be difficult for them to go through the session. I rather like this place,—'tis on the sea, a fine country, though not beautiful. Mrs. Grattan 's better: the rest well.—Yours ever,

H. G.

Mr. Grattan's remarks on the subject of the Union are worth recording. His opinions never varied, and will be alluded to in a subsequent part. Some discrepancy having appeared to the author in the various calculations made respecting the trade of Ireland before and after the Union, he applied to Mr. Grattan to explain it, and hence the following letters were written. The numerous statements on this subject are fallacious in the extreme, particularly among those who of late have been employed and paid to write in support of the Union. Time and facts will expose these errors; but unfortunately they are proved by the poverty and decay of the wholesome trade and manufactures of Ireland, and the backward state of that

* My brother and I had gone on the Walcheren expedition; he was attacked with fever and ague, and was saved by not going to an English doctor. A number of persons died in consequence of their unwillingness to call in foreign physicians.

† The death of the Duke of Portland did not make any material change in the administration. Lord Wellesley accepted office as Secretary for Foreign Affairs; his brother, Wellesley Pole, as Secretary for Ireland, in place of Mr. Dundas; and Mr. Wilson Croker, as Secretary to the Admiralty in place of Mr. W. Pole—thus were his services in the Duke of York's affair rewarded. Mr. Perceval wrote, in the month of September, to Lord Grenville and Lord Grey, with a view to form an extended and combined administration. He stated that no idea existed in his, or Lord Liverpool's mind, *of the necessity of any dereliction of public principle on either side.* An offer to form such a coalition was naturally declined by persons who retained a regard for public opinion and consistent conduct. Lord Grenville came to town on the subject, but Lord Grey, very properly, would not leave Northumberland on such an invitation.

country in comparison with every other on the face of the globe.

MR. GRATTAN TO HENRY GRATTAN.

Brighton, December 3, 1809.

MY DEAR HENRY,—In James's letter he said as follows:—That the Union promised, but did not give, any new settlers in Ireland, with their capitals; nor any new branches of commerce; nor any new markets: on the contrary, that England got a greater possession of our markets, and we, in proportion, a lesser, than formerly. The first part of the sentence is true; the latter (which I have interlined), though true, is not the whole truth; for though she has gotten a greater proportion of our markets, we have gotten a greater proportion of hers; but the main assertion is perfectly true,—the Union has not given us new capital or new trade; that export trade (that is to say, the beneficial trade of the country) is the old trade of Ireland, increasing from its nature, not from the Union. I have looked over the particulars, and I don't see any article of it that can be attributed to the Union, except a few thousand pounds of wine, and perhaps drapery; something amounting to a few thousand pounds imported *into England* since the Union, which could not be imported before. The export trade that Ireland has is a *legacy of the Irish Parliament;* it is the export of linen and of provisions. You will observe there are two valuations of exports and imports; one called *official,* the other called *real or current* price. The first is the valuation made at the Custom-House many years ago; but you should know that the valuation called current price, or real value, made in Ireland, differs from the valuation made in England. The Irish valuation is an increase of above double; the English not half so much. The Irish Custom-House values the exportation of Ireland in 1809 according to real value, 12,000,000*l.*; the official value is 5,900,000*l.*—Yours,

H. G.

SAME TO SAME.

Brighton, December 6th, 1809.

MY DEAR HENRY,—With regard to Cobbett, it is not the Parliamentary debates, but the Parliamentary history. Don't get the book till I write again. James's paper is an

extract from the public accounts, and *can't be averred against.* Take care of it, and send it back when you have done with it. The growth of the export trade of Ireland is what it there appears to be: Newenham is no authority against a public account.

	Official Value.
In 1785 our exports were	£3,779,570
In 1792 our exports were	5,387,760
Increase in 7 years as above	£1,608,190

Or near one half.

In 1803 the exports were	£5,090,393
In 1809 the exports were	5,922,591
Increase in 7 years since the Union . . .	£832,198

Less than one-sixth.

The *old* export trade, I think you call it so, appears as above to have been—

In 1792	£5,387,760
Our export in 1809	5,922,591
Increase in 17 years	£534,831

Or about *one-ninth.*

Take the trade at the real value, and the proportion will be the same. Observe, if the real value of our exports was in 1809 equal to 12,597,517*l.*, the real value of our exports in 1792, at the market rateage, was 11,000,000*l.*, and above it. From this it follows that the export trade, since the Union, has not kept up its proportional increase. The cause of your mistake with regard to the export and import is this,—you suppose the official to be the real value. Now the real value of the export is more than double that of the official value; and the real value of the import is only a fifth more, or thereabouts.

For example, the exportation of the year 1809 appears to be—

In real value	£12,597,517
The *import* trade, according to the rateage of 20 per cent., about	9,500,000
Balance in favour of our *export*	£3,000,000

'Tis very probable, as I mentioned in my last letter, that the officer at the Custom-House overvalues the *exports*, and that the *imports* are considerably undervalued; but you can't rectify either; still less can you argue against both. It would not be creditable to make any erroneous concession in favour of the Union, or any erroneous charge to its prejudice. The great fact regarding the trade of Ireland on the subject of the Union is, she has gotten no new branch of trade. Her export trade has not increased in a greater proportion since the Union than before. The same articles it may be said were not of the same value seventeen years ago—*negatur*—they were of the same value, but the money has changed its value, and is reduced.—Yours ever,

H. G.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. HARDY.

5, Bolton Row, London, February 15, 1810.

MY DEAR HARDY,—I got your letter, and shall certainly consider the subject of it. I hope your health is tolerably good; a gouty man is never very well or very ill. The Ministry continue: how long they will do so 'tis difficult to say; but there is an inquiry,* which you will perceive to be very long, and likely to be longer. What has appeared is certainly not in favour of the administration; but whether it will turn them out is doubtful. They want speakers, and they want what is more material to them,—numbers; and yet I don't hear of any stir to dismiss them. The power of the Crown is such as can support almost whomever the King pleases. How goes on your book? when shall it appear? You never write one word of news; therefore you should have none. Is there any truth about the removing of regiments or reducing our troops? What

* The inquiry into the policy and conduct of the expedition to the Scheldt: it began the 2nd of February, and lasted to the 30th of March.

measures do you understand are intended? What do the Catholics intend?

Remember to our friends, the few that are alive.*—Yours most truly,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

Feb. 19th, 1810.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I have, in consequence of your letter and of Mrs. Byrne's relationship, attended much to Hay.† I heard him at large, and often. I got the newspaper with the Catholic resolutions: their resolutions I read. I am glad they did not reflect on Lord Grenville.‡

I will read the *Hibernian* on the Veto, and thank you much for the papers.

The business of the inquiry suspends other Parliamentary subjects. Pending the inquiry the Ministers must remain, I should think; but after, it is thought by many, they will go out.

Ponsonby has spoken this session extremely well.

I am glad Day§ is well: I was uneasy about him. Let me know what was the cause of his fall; whether it was anything of a paralytic nature. What are the feelings of the Catholics regarding Lord Grenville's letter?—Yours truly,

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

London, April 9th, 1810.

MY DEAR DR. BERWICK,—I beg you will mention to Matthew‖ the state of politics here,—that there has been

* He alludes to the death of his friend and neighbour, Lord Powerscourt. On the 20th of July preceding, he wrote—"Lord Powerscourt died yesterday, of a fortnight's illness, which appeared to be dangerous the last week, and proved gout on the kidneys. He is a great loss, public and private; an honest, independent man, who spent a large fortune in his own country." It was Lord Powerscourt who moved the amendment at the Union, denying the right of the Legislature to part with the constitution of the country. The above is a just tribute to his memory.

† Secretary to the Catholics, a well-meaning person; very busy, always in a bustle, and extremely loquacious.

‡ He had addressed a strong letter to Lord Fingall, on the subject of the veto. He looked to the Chancellorship of Oxford, and was soon after elected.

§ Judge Day, his earliest and most attached friend.—See *ante*, vol. i.

‖ The old gardener at Esker.

a riot about sending Sir Francis Burdett to the Tower, but that this morning he has been sent there. Tell him, if he were Minister, he would never have gotten himself into such an embarrassment; ask him what he thinks with respect to the Catholics; and let me have his sentiments on these subjects. *A bad time.* Who is the Dean of St. Patrick's?* Your friend Tegart† is well: I see him often. Is your health good? Write me something regarding Ireland, besides Matthew's sentiments.

I don't think the Ministry will stir immediately; they will probably first try to get recruits. How are your neighbours? Remember me to Mrs. Vesey. Best regards to Mrs. B. and children.—Yours truly,

H. G.

Sir Francis Burdett occupied for a long time the attention of the English people, and enjoyed their approbation. His political life was chequered and singular,—the reverse at the close of what it was in the beginning. He commenced more than a Whig; he ended more than a Tory. At the outset he was violent in favour of the English people and of their liberties—of the Irish "*Helots*" and their rights; but at the close of his life he became hostile to both, and particularly inveterate against the latter. On the occasion above alluded to, he had published in "Cobbett's Register" a letter to his constituents of Westminster, and a long argument on the subject of Mr. Gale Jones's imprisonment by the House of Commons, the power and authority of which body he there denied. This was voted a breach of privilege; and on the motion of Sir Thomas Lethbridge, his commitment to the Tower was carried by 190 to 152. Mr. Grattan strongly opposed it, and voted against the motion. He said—"He lamented the subject had

* Mr. Ponsonby, afterwards Bishop of Derry, (an excellent man) expected to be appointed.

† The well known Tegart of Pall Mall, a friend of Lord Moira and the Prince.

been brought before Parliament. It was a contest in which victory would be without glory, and in which defeat must be followed by disgrace; and when the House went to hunt out for questions of privilege, they diminished their own dignity. They might depend on it, the result of the contest would not tend to their satisfaction. Had they forgotten Wilkes's case? Did they not know that it ended in his being elected for Middlesex, and nominated Chamberlain of the City of London, and that Parliament was obliged to shrink from the contest? In this battle between the giant and the dwarf, the giant diminished in size and the dwarf magnified. The people of England, with their characteristic generosity, would range themselves on the weaker side, and oppose the shield of their compassion against the arm of power." Sir Francis then addressed a letter to the Speaker, denying the validity of his warrant: he bade him defiance, and turned his officer out of his house. There he entrenched himself from the 5th to the 9th of April. The people took his part, and considerable rioting ensued. The houses of the Ministers were attacked; the military were called out; several persons were wounded, and some lives were lost. His house in Piccadilly presented a singular appearance.* The military having interfered, Sir Francis applied to the civil power, and a party of peace officers were sent to protect him. A party of military† were sent to watch him; and the mob compelled all who passed by to salute him. The Serjeant-at-Arms thought it necessary to get the Attorney-General's (Gibbs)

* The author was residing next street to Sir Francis.

† The Duke of Cumberland's Regiment (the 15th Hussars) was said to be particularly active and inimical to the people: they were, in consequence, sent from town, in order to prevent further collision. The author was returning from the Opera, when one man was shot, and another cut down, and he fortunately escaped with his life.

opinion as to his right to break open the door, and he demanded a force of 300 infantry and 500 cavalry as an escort. At length an entrance was effected, and Sir Francis was lodged in the Tower, where he remained until Parliament was prorogued. Meantime, he served the Speaker with notice of an action for trespass and false imprisonment.

As a public character, Sir Francis excited considerable interest,—more at the commencement of his career than at the close. His appearance was that of a gentleman, and not in the least that of a tribune; he had a good figure, a graceful air, and a pleasing tone of voice; he was not an eloquent, but he was an agreeable speaker; he had a fine Parliamentary pathos, an austere gravity, and a monitorial manner which was not to be found in the qualities of a demagogue. No man appeared less spoiled than he was by the frequent practice of addressing public meetings. He had, however, contracted the bad habit of attacking individuals in their absence; and this, perhaps, was the only vulgar error he had suffered himself to fall into. He assailed Mr. Canning and Mr. Tierney, but was worsted in both encounters, particularly in the latter. His style of address was fine, and was above his matter; for he did not argue well, though he remembered well and replied well to what was said; and though not in a regular fire, yet in good strong separate sentences. He never said anything that proved him to be a man of a strong mind; and though a prominent advocate for liberty, and a professed friend of the people, yet he showed that he was incapable of taking the lead; and if he had been put at their head, he would have been displaced within half an hour.

His doctrines as a politician were strangely in-

consistent and deficient. The principles he advanced were not calculated for any sort of government; they were the very worst possible. He united the wildest spirit of democracy with a tame submission to royalty, and showed that he was exactly the man who would support a despotism. His principles that were not prerogative, were anarchic; he not only would have had vote by ballot, but annual parliaments and universal suffrage,—*i. e.*, chaos: servants—soldiers—all were to vote.

Thus, his proposition for reform would have done great mischief; the plan would have increased the power of the Crown, instead of diminishing it; for he would have restored to the King his old prerogative, under the idea that the King would give up his influence; but the King would not have done any such thing; he would have kept his modern influence, and would have added to it his old prerogative.

The letter he wrote on the privilege of Parliament showed an ignorance of the constitution; it was not written by a man who was a lawyer, but by one who wished to be thought a lawyer. When he abandoned his early friends, and deserted his early principles, he inflicted a deep wound on the character of public men. He taught the people to believe that no confidence could be placed in them, that no consistency was required from them, that there was no distinction of party in the State; and that, notwithstanding their declared opinions, unequivocal assurances, and solemn protestations, politicians were at best only speculators or impostors, and that they could play the part of the renegade without the loss of reputation. His doctrines and his practice would have unseated the House of Hanover, and have subverted the British constitution.

In the Tower of London his career terminated; the people had prepared for him an ovation; they were to lead away their injured captive in pride and triumph, and never doubted that he would have headed their procession; but their favourite disappointed them, and stole away from his party by water. At length some men began to doubt his courage, others his principles, and many his judgment: the two last were right; for when such a character becomes prudent, he is undone.

CHAPTER XII.

Irish tithes.—Mr. Grattan brings on the Catholic question in 1810.—Domestic nomination of Catholic bishops disregarded by ministers.—Mr. Grattan complains of his absence from Ireland.—Injury from absenteeism.—His life in London.—Visits to Richmond to Mr. Sharp.—Samuel Rogers.—Cumberland.—Interesting conversation.—Anecdote of Kean and Miss O'Neill.—Leadership of the opposition offered to Tierney, accepted by Ponsonby.—Distress of Ireland.—Resolutions against the Union.—Public meeting and petitions against.—Mr. Grattan's answer and opinion thereon.—Banks's charge that Ireland was a burthen to England.—Foster's spirited reply.—Illness of George III.—Conduct of Mr. Perceval.—Mr. Grattan's letter.—Opposes the restrictions on the Regency.—Mr. Ponsonby's able speech.—Defeat of ministers on the household.—Mr. Grattan's speech.—Prince accepts the office.—Lord Grenville, auditor of the exchequer, refuses to issue the public money.—Unconstitutional power assumed by the Commons.—Conduct of Sheridan.—Court intrigues.—Arrangement of the new ministry.—Lord Grenville and Lord Grey dissatisfied.—The No-Popery administration continued.—Mr. Grattan disclaims a spurious reply to Flood.—Letters to M'Can.—Letter on the Irish finances.—Sir John Newport's motion.—Mr. Grattan's letter on reform.—On the interchange of militia.—Letters to James Grattan, in Sicily, on public affairs.

In the month of April, 1810, Mr. Henry Parnell proposed that a committee of the House of Commons should be appointed to inquire into the mode of paying tithes in Ireland. Mr. Grattan spoke in favour of this motion, and strongly supported it, but it was rejected by 69 to 48. On the 18th of May he renewed the motion respecting the Catholics, whose petition he had presented on the 27th of February; on which occasion he alluded to the Veto, declaring "that he would not enter into the subject; whether he had misinformed the House, or the Catholics had been guilty of retractation, was a question he would never agitate, it being his fixed principle never to defend himself at the expense of his country; but he would submit to the House the danger of a foreign influence, and the necessity of securing the country against a French nomination of the

Irish Catholic bishops." Mr. Plowden, in his history, represents Mr. Grattan as saying that his opinion was in favour of a Veto, but this was a mistake: no such statement appears in the parliamentary debates, nor in the speeches on the subject published by authority.

It happened that at this moment the Catholics were growing discontented; they had been disappointed. From the Whigs they expected a great deal, and got little. General distrust was the result, and gave rise to a dissatisfied spirit. Mr. Grattan's sentiments and expressions were misrepresented; and the angry feeling which had arisen in 1807 on the subject of the insurrection bills, was now fast spreading, and threatened to break out, as it did a few years afterwards, when it led to the withdrawing the Catholic petition from him, and entrusting it to another. Such changes must ever attend upon politics; it is the fate of public men to experience them; but it is not always their good fortune to bear them (as he did) with serenity.

The question came forward under a new shape, and domestic nomination was the proposal substituted in place of the Veto. Mr. Grattan observed that domestic nomination obtained by consent of the Pope, whether placed in the chapter or the Catholic bishops, would not affect the Pope's authority of investiture of institution, or of any spiritual functions. This proposition was not, however, received by the House much better than the Veto had been; the question was adjourned, the debate renewed on the 25th, and again adjourned to the 1st June, when Mr. Grattan, in reply, stated the resolutions of the Catholic bishops, in which they say they are ready to yield for the security of the state everything which does not affect the rights or integrity of their church. But though this offer was fair, and

was all that could be required, the Government did not think fit to close with them on the subject, and thereby put an end to this lengthened and dangerous contest.

Mr. Ponsonby entered into a statement of his conduct on the question of the Veto, and the letters and communications with Dr. Milner, of last session, and showed that he had not gone beyond the instructions he received, or the offers that had then been made. Mr. Grattan seems to have made a very able reply* on this occasion; but on a division the number for going into a committee was only 109, and against it, 213,—majority against the Catholics, 104.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, June 11th, 1810.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I shall send you the speeches† as published; they are taken in substance; the reply is only the substance of what I said. The introductory speech is near the original speech.

I shall see you in July, and you must spend some time at Tinnehinch. We go to Tunbridge on Tuesday, and I shall leave it in a month, and the ladies will go to the sea.

Write me the news of Dublin. Direct to me at Tunbridge Wells, England. I long very much to see my friends in Ireland, and next year I shall spend most of my time there. I am tired of the expense of England, *and the vagabond life which I am obliged to lead.* The remainder of my life shall be spent, a few months excepted, in Ireland.

I have got an insolvent bill for the Irish debtors; but it could not go as far as they wished, nor has it passed as soon as I could desire.

I carried it up to the Lords one fortnight ago: it received the royal assent on Saturday. Mrs. G. is much

* Sir James Mackintosh said that the best view of the argument on the Catholic subject was presented by a perusal of Lord Grenville's speech in 1808, in conjunction with that of Mr. Grattan in 1810.—Year 1819 in the 2nd vol. Mackintosh's Memoirs.

† The speeches in the Lords and Commons on the debate, were published, by authority, in one vol. 8vo.

better. The rest well,—all beg to be remembered to you. —Yours, H. G.

The "*vagabond*," or erratic life that Mr. Grattan complains of, was one of the consequences of the Union. The Irish, who were migratory through habit, were now rendered more so by necessity. The great landed proprietors of the country being English, were absentees, and the next class of society, in a great degree followed their example. The country, degraded from the dignity of a nation, and sunk in its own esteem, was subject to the evils that follow from servility, or fashion, or taste, or necessity. Thus absenteeism increased more and more every day, and, like a cancer, corroded the state, and consumed its substance. The English liked the system, as it brought them money and business, promoted their manufactures, and threw back those of their former rival; they considered their estates sufficiently secure, notwithstanding the absence of those who had so long acted the part of sentinels, and stood guard to protect British possessions from the evils that necessarily ensue where hordes of tenants are left unaided and uninstructed, and estates* unvisited and unimproved. The injury thereby done to the country arose to such a height that she seemed fast recurring to the state Swift had represented her in his time, and to be in the possession, as well as the occupation, of a frieze-coated population, when, for an entire day, the traveller might pass through various parts of Ireland without† beholding the

* The Bath estates, situate in the county of Monaghan, are reputed to comprise 60,000 Irish acres, the Marquis, who holds half, has no residence, and was never known to come there; the other half has latterly rather improved; on it are supposed to be 4,000 tenants and 20,000 inhabitants—it presents a beggarly miserable appearance to the traveller.

† The Irish aristocracy were forced to submit to severe and bitter reproofs even from the drollest of the English members. In the debate February 22nd, 1810, Mr. Fuller said, "Let the great men of the

abode of a single resident gentleman. This national calamity gave rise to a matter of serious apprehension, and many began to fear that the words of an ancient statesman would be realized, and the goods of the absent and indifferent would at length become the property of the enterprising and the present.

No person was more alive to a sense of the evils of absenteeism than Mr. Grattan, and nobody deprecated them more strongly: he felt the injury, and beheld the poverty it produced; he was aware how difficult it was for one country to hold another whose people she had robbed of their property, and then proscribed on account of their religion. Residence, care, attention,—a fostering hand, a benevolent heart, and a gentle tongue, he conceived to be the indispensable requisites for the peace and prosperity of Ireland, and the continuance of her alliance with Great Britain.

But Mr. Grattan was scarcely entitled to complain of the annual absence of six months from Ireland, and had less reason to be dissatisfied than any of the hundred Irish members; for if personal considerations were considered, the result of the Union had been to him most gratifying, as he had the satisfaction of beholding his fame, his principles, and the whole tenor of his life, not only vindicated, but triumphant. He rose, while those who had opposed him, and aspersed him, and had been set on to libel him and his country, sunk into oblivion, and were abandoned by the very party who had instigated them. Even Mr. Canning, who, in 1799, had been the encomiast of Dr. Duigenan, now enjoined silence, and seemed pleased at the facetious appellation of "*the muzzled doctor*,"—a title which

country go home, and in place of spending their money here, let them regulate their own tenantry and their estates and not hear of them only through those secondary persons whom they employ."

was conferred upon him in consequence of the unwilling taciturnity he was obliged to observe in Parliament. Neither had the habits of public business rendered Mr. Grattan averse to the enjoyments of the society he met with in London. After his successful speech in 1805, he was courted and invited by the leading men of both parties. Holland House, Spencer* House, Devonshire House, and Buckingham† House, furnished a number of talented individuals, whose company he relished, and who, in return, seemed pleased and gladdened by his society; yet the love of *home* was dear to him, and absence from his country grew painful; he ever bore in mind the words of his native poet—

> "Where'er I roam, whatever realms I see
> My heart untravell'd fondly turns to thee."

His taste for the country was with him a *passion*, and governed all his movements. He loved the banks of the Thames, Richmond Hill, Twickenham, and the Duke of Buccleugh's meadows; and Pope's Villa afforded him sauntering walks and delightful recreation; and like a boy from school, he used, after a tedious, heavy debate, to boat up the Thames and walk beneath the lofty elms that adorn its banks, enjoying the melody of the birds and the sweetness of the fields and flowers. In the pursuit of these enjoyments he was not without companions, and even rivals. Samuel

* The habit at Spencer-house was to break up at twelve o'clock; Lady Spencer complained that Mr. Grattan's conversation inveigled her guests past the hour, and, tapping him on the shoulder, told him she would send for her night-cap.

† The Marchioness of Buckingham was an Irishwoman and a Catholic; when her husband was Lord-Lieutenant in Ireland, Mr. Grattan had violent political differences with him, but those disputes were now at an end, and she wished for reconciliation; a large dinner party was therefore made, and Mr. Grattan was invited; she was very anxious he should come, and waited at the landing-place on the stairs until she heard the servant announce his name; when she found he was inside her doors, she withdrew, saying that she was satisfied with her success. This circumstance she related with great pleasure.

Rogers, Horner,* Sharpe, and other friends, joined in his country excursions; and to the place of the latter, near Boxhill, they used to repair, to hear the nightingales in that neighbourhood of talent and of beauty; in the vicinity of the Beauclerks† and the Locks, amidst the charming scenery of Norbury Park;—all these had their attractions, yet they could not banish the affection for his valley of Tinnehinch, and its tranquil and sweet simplicity.

In 1809, Mr. Grattan met Sir Arthur Pigott and Mr. Wilberforce at Eastbourn, and derived much pleasure from their society; the sober, sound sense, and constitutional mind of the former, and the calm, yet lively and varied conversation of the latter. In both there was much to instruct, to interest, and to please.

Mr. Wilberforce lived surrounded with books and letters, and devoured every new production with the avidity of a boy. He knew nothing of Ireland; but he was of use on the Catholic ques-

* "FRANCIS HORNER TO HIS SISTER ANN (afterwards MRS. POWER.)

MY DEAR NANCY,—I have been passing Saturday and Sunday at Mr. Sharpe's, at Mickleham, with Mr. Grattan; and it was a very agreeable excursion. I went and returned with Mr. Grattan, whose conversation about Ireland, and especially the past history of Ireland, as well as upon literature, is full of interest and genius. He has been giving me to-day, as we came to town, the history of what was done at the famous period of 1782; and he made me acquainted with some parts of that great transaction, and particularly his own share in it, which I did not know before. This little excursion was on purpose to hear the nightingales, for he loves music like an Italian, and the country like a true-born Englishman. Both beauties are in full perfection at Redley, where there are more nightingales in chorus than are to be heard any where else. He is full of English and Latin poetry, too, and deals very much in passages from both, when he is at his ease; which, with his ardour for Ireland, and his characteristic sketches of persons with whom he has acted in public life, and a great deal of fun, and benevolence, and sense, above all things, make him a very entertaining companion. At the age of seventy, too, for I fear he is nearly as much, and with the veneration that belongs to his name from the figure he has made in our politics, it is impossible not to take a deep interest in one who renders himself so accessible and so instructive.—Yours, F. H."—*Horner's Correspondence*, vol. ii.

† Three great beauties resided there, Mrs. Charles Lock, Mrs. William Lock, and Mrs. Beauclerk.

tion, and his support latterly gave it a character that was of service to the cause in England.

Samuel Rogers* was at Tunbridge Wells in the autumn of 1810, and introduced Mr. Grattan to Cumberland, who then resided there. Books, plays, dramatic writers, the performers in the leading characters and popular parts, and their different style of acting, formed the chief subject of conversation, which was thus rendered extremely interesting. Rogers seemed natural, simple, and just. Cumberland appeared rather fastidious.† Mr. Grattan had great relish for this society. He had been fond of the drama; knew by heart most of the fine passages of the best dramatists, and had studied their plays, particularly those of Shakspeare, with great attention. He used to relate with singular precision the merits and defects of the different performers, from the times of Garrick‡, Mossop, and Barry, Mrs. Fitzhenry, and Miss Farren, down to those of Kemble, Kean§, Mrs. Siddons, and Miss O'Neill.‖ He would bring before his company this

* The poet, a great admirer and friend of Mr. Grattan; a charming agreeable companion, replete with taste, anecdote, and information.

† He said that Shakspeare had never written a perfect tragedy or comedy.

‡ He admired Garrick in Richard the Third, said his acting was excellent. Kemble pleased him in it also.

§ Kean had not acted Macbeth before he came to Ireland. When he was on a visit at Tinnehinch he studied the part, and got Mr. Grattan's opinion on several passages. Having made a party with Mrs. Kean and others to visit the waterfall, he galloped away and disappeared; at length he was found in one of the glades, the horse grazing beneath an oak, and Kean vociferating aloud, acting Macbeth with all his might. The week after he appeared in the character and was warmly received by the Dublin audience; towards the close of the play his voice did not sustain itself, but Mr. Grattan liked him and thought he acted it well; he said it was the most difficult part in all Shakspeare.

On another occasion I induced Mr. Berwick and him to see Miss O'Neill in Ophelia. We dined early, and as professed amateurs we took our places in the pit. She acted admirably, and at one of the most interesting scenes, I looked to my *two veterans* to see how they liked her—I beheld them both in tears; it was unnecessary to ask their opinion further.

‖ In Juliet he liked her extremely, he said the scene at the balcony sh

galaxy of constellations, and pourtray their varied arts with great felicity.

In the winter of this year he met, at Brighton, Lord John Townsend, Lord Aberdeen, Sir William Gell, Mr. Creevey, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Trevor, and Mr. Rogers; they formed a very pleasant society, and all seemed charmed with Mr. Grattan. They liked his ways and the simplicity of his manner; and as they made it a rule to avoid politics, they were, in consequence, more agreeable and more accordant.

The leadership of the Opposition is an arduous and difficult post. England requires not merely a man of great ability, but of extensive personal weight; he must belong to the aristocracy as well as the people, and unite popular principles with aristocratic connections.

The nobles of England do not always like a courtier, but they are sure to dislike a tribune, and are as desirous that the country should be protected against the dangers of the democracy as against the influence of the Crown. The individual must know not only how to lead, but how to please his troops. He must be affable in manner, generous in disposition, have a ready hand, an open house, and a full purse. He must be grave and gay, lively and severe. He must have a good cook for the English members, fine words and fair promises for the Irish, and sober calculations for the Scotch. He must sacrifice time, and temper, and fortune; his private affairs, his health, and his constitution.

Such a person could lead the Opposition, and such a person was now sought for. The party

acts admirably—the words, "*It is the lark*, and not the nightingale," she speaks incomparably, nothing can be better, she is so natural and so unaffected, her tones are fine, her voice good, and a soft articulation, the reverse of Mrs. Siddons. I saw Mrs. Barry act Juliet, it was a famous part of hers, and she did not act it better than Miss O'Neill.

looked to Mr. Tierney. He was a friend of the Prince,* and might have been of service; he was a man of very considerable ability; but neither his health nor his fortune enabled him to accept the situation. The request made to him by his friends was signed by Mr. Grattan, who gladly availed himself of the opportunity to manifest the sense he entertained of his merits and talent. Mr. Ponsonby, however, was selected. He had English connection, high and powerful; the amenity of his manners, and the gentleness of his disposition, procured him numerous friends; they persuaded him to fill the office; and he amply repaid the trust that was reposed in him; but in discharging this duty he sacrificed a great part of his fortune, and it may be said he also sacrificed his life.

LORD DUNCANNON TO MR. GRATTAN.

September 8th, 1810.

DEAR SIR,—In consequence of a letter from you, sent to me by Lord Holland, I beg to inform you that the letter, with the signatures, was sent to Mr. Tierney, and that I have received his answer. He feels himself much flattered by the proposition that has been made to him of taking a leading part in the House of Commons in the next session, in the necessary Parliamentary arrangements; and agreeing entirely with those who signed it, and the sentiments expressed in it, he readily accedes to their wishes as far as the state of his health will allow him to do so.—Believe me, dear Sir, your very faithful and humble servant,

DUNCANNON.

The distress of Ireland, her inability to bear taxation, and her difficulty to keep pace with the

* The Prince, in 1806, wanted Tierney to be Chancellor of the Irish Exchequer; Mr. Grattan and Lord Hutchinson went to Carlton House to oppose the appointment. For thus thwarting his job, the Prince forgave Mr. Grattan, but not Lord Hutchinson.

growing exigencies of the empire was increasing every year — and occasioned much discontent among her people; at length, in the month of September, 1810, the Grand Jury of the city of Dublin began to assume a degree of courage, and to display some national feeling; they passed several resolutions on the subject, in one of which they complained that "The Act of Union, after ten years' operation, instead of augmenting the comforts, prosperity, and happiness of the people, agreeably to the hopes held out by the advocates of that measure, had produced an accumulation of distress, and, instead of cementing, they feared that, if not repealed, it might endanger the connexion between the sister islands."

The resolutions were presented to Mr. Grattan, and in his reply he stated, "That he was an enemy to the extinguishment of the Irish parliament, and was a friend to its restoration."

In the same month a public meeting of the freemen and freeholders of Dublin was held at the Royal Exchange, at which resolutions of the same tendency were adopted, and petitions to the King and to Parliament were agreed on; these were entrusted to Mr. Grattan, and were accompanied with an address embodying their substance, and calling upon him to support their prayer, to which he gave the following answer:—

GENTLEMEN,—I have the honour to receive an address presented by your committee, and expressive of their wishes that I should present certain petitions, and support the repeal of an act entitled the Act of Union. And your committee adds, that it speaks with the authority of my constituents, the freemen and freeholders of the city of Dublin.

I beg to assure your committee, and through them my much-beloved and much-respected constituents, that I shall accede to their proposition, I shall present their petitions,

and support the repeal of the Act of Union, with a decided attachment to our connexion with Great Britain, and to that harmony between the two countries without which the connexion cannot last. I do not impair either, as I apprehend, when I assure you that I shall support the repeal of the Act of Union. You will please to observe that a proposition of that sort in Parliament, to be either prudent or possible, must wait until it shall be called for and backed by the nation. When proposed, I shall then, as at all times I hope I shall, prove myself an Irishman, and that Irishman whose first and last passion was his native country.

As to the personal approbation with which you have honoured me, it is, I must say, your kindness that overrates my pretensions; but I have one pretension which neither age, nor time, nor distance, can efface,—an attachment to Ireland unaltered and unalterable.

I have the honour to be, with the greatest esteem, your very humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

Dublin, October 4th, 1810.

On this important subject, which occupies the public mind so much at present, and has engrossed that of the masses of the people of Ireland,* Mr. Grattan's opinion, from first to last, did not undergo any change whatever; he always considered it a bad measure, very injurious to Ireland, and likely to prove dangerous to the connexion and fatal to the stability of the empire. He thought that the two countries would have gone on together much better if the Act of Union had not taken place, and he feared that, if Buonaparte succeeded, the measure would greatly increase the danger of separation.

He observed that the Union had not diminished

* Meetings of large bodies (in some cases hundreds of thousands) have been held in various parts of Ireland in 1843-4, 5, and have all pronounced against the Union: it is calculated that upwards of four millions of the people of Ireland have declared in favour of a repeal of the Union—the aristocracy, however, hang back, as they always have.—*Note by Editor.*

jobbing; that it had ruined the citizens of Dublin, impaired their fortunes, and destroyed their consequence; that it had deprived all men (with the exception of a few)* of all political ardour, it had destroyed their ambition, and deprived the country of a great portion of its talent, as few men could now get into Parliament. It served Ponsonby and me, for we have risen and triumphed over our old enemies, *the men who did all the mischief in Ireland!* As to her finances, the contribution is too great, the country cannot pay it. The *absentee debt* is two millions, and Ireland has not half a million for the current expenses. Add the *absentee list*, upwards of three millions; the imperial contribution, six millions; and the absentee interest of the debt; and compare them with the profits arising from the export trade, and these sink absolutely to nothing.

Lord Castlereagh said at the Union that her expenses would be two millions in war and one million and a half in peace. See how his predictions have been verified! If Government levy taxes at the rate and increase of the present† year, they will create a rebellion; the country cannot pay her proportion. I do not see how she can stand it. If the Union benefits the country, it will take a very long time.

With respect to the Catholics, they now find the Ministers obstinate in their refusal, *and they will not thank England for their rights.* Lord Liverpool now says that he takes his stand, and thinks that enough has been granted to them, that he will abide by the settlement of the Union and will concede no more. Thus the Catholics find that, instead of the promises held out by Mr. Pitt

* This applies most truly to the aristocracy of Ireland; always a poor set except when forced on by the people as in '79 and '82.

† Taxes to the amount of 320,000*l.* had been imposed.

being fulfilled, the Union has proved not an advantage, but a bar to their claims.

Such were the sentiments Mr. Grattan entertained on these subjects. A short while after, it happened that an additional duty upon tobacco in Ireland was passed in the House of Commons; and on this occasion Mr. Bankes said that *Ireland was becoming a burthen to England.* This expression greatly offended Mr. Grattan, and after the digression he observed that Mr. Bankes was wrong in saying that Ireland was a burthen to England, that he was not at all justified in saying so. Ireland is not to be considered a burthen because she contributes so much less this year than the last, but a benefit so far as she contributes the imperial quota; in fact, it is too large, and she cannot pay it, but that is no proof that she is a burthen. Mr. Foster was greatly roused at this unlucky phrase; he displayed much national ardour and strong Irish feeling; and in his reply to Mr. Bankes he said that the Union was forced upon Ireland, that she had not asked for it, and with great indignation he exclaimed, "*Take back your Union! take back your Union!!*" The House were struck by his spirit on the occasion;* but, like the forebodings of Cassandra, his words passed unheeded by.

On this point Mr. Grattan observed, "The Union could very easily be dissolved; there can be no obstacle to the repeal of an Act of Parliament. The influence of the Crown would be thereby lessened; for the boroughs are so diminished that the aristocratic power would be greatly decreased; but objections of that nature are no reasons against the repeal. The aristocracy might be afraid of the Catholics, from their

* The author was witness to the scene; Mr. Foster spoke with such ardour and spirit, that the English members said he was tipsy.

weight in the representation and from their numbers in the House of Commons, and that they would exclaim against paying the Established Church; but that would be no objection, for it cannot be said that the payment of the Protestant clergy should be a bar to the restoration of Irish liberty."

On the 11th of November, Parliament was assembled, but, in consequence of the bad state of his Majesty's health, was adjourned to the 14th, and from that day to the 24th and 29th, and finally to the 13th of December, when a committee was appointed to examine the physicians respecting the King's health. They had previously been examined by the Privy Council, and, in the debate on the 29th, Mr. Perceval had made their testimony a ground for the adjournment of the House. This unconstitutional proceeding was strongly objected to, and by Mr. Ponsonby in particular, but the Minister prevailed. Mr. Grattan thus gave his opinion on the subject.

MR. GRATTAN TO HENRY GRATTAN.

Brighton, December 4th, 1810.

MY DEAR HENRY,—The report of the Privy Council is no evidence to ground the vote of adjournment. The vote of adjournment amounted to a declaration that the state of the King's health was such as to warrant a further suspension of the executive government; but of the state of the King's health the two Houses knew nothing but by common report, an examination of physicians before another body, which body had no right to send their report to either House of Parliament to interfere on the subject. The only bodies capable of pronouncing on the health of the King are the Lords and Commons. As it has happened, the body, namely, the Privy Council, who had no right to come to a conclusion on the subject, have held the examination, and the bodies whose duty and right it was to decide have held none. Could the Houses of Parliament, on an examination before the Council, transfer to a regent the executive power? Certainly not. It follows that they

could, on such an examination, agree to a suspension of the executive power. The vote of adjournment *was that.*

Write to me. I like the debate, that is, some of the speeches. The Chancellor,* they say, spoke well, that is, I suppose, with craft. I dare say he and Westmoreland were exactly what you say. Yours,

HENRY GRATTAN.

On the 19th of December, Mr. Perceval wrote to the Prince, and communicated to him his plan of a restricted regency, similar to that in 1789, but allowing him to confer peerages for naval and military services. It was to continue for a year and six weeks after the commencement of the next session of Parliament. The Prince objected, saying that this was not like the case of Mr. Pitt's regency, after both Houses of Parliament had agreed to certain resolutions, and which he would not animadvert on; but before such resolutions were passed, which he could not anticipate Parliament would agree to finally, he said that he would refer to his letter of 1789. He then summoned his brothers and the Duke of Gloucester, and they drew up a letter to Mr. Perceval, which they all signed, protesting against a restricted regency.

Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Ponsonby objected to the mode of proceeding adopted by Mr. Perceval; and a call of the House was ordered for the 20th, when Mr. Perceval proposed three resolutions, declaring, that by reason of the indisposition of his Majesty, the "*royal authority was thereby for the present interrupted;*" the 2nd, declaring it to be the duty of the Lords and Commons to supply the defect in such manner as the case may require; and the 3rd, that the Lords and Commons should proceed by bill. This was opposed

* Lord Eldon.

by Mr. Ponsonby, who moved, as an amendment, an address to the Prince of Wales, calling on him to assume the sovereign authority during the illness of his Majesty.

On this subject he made a most able, masterly speech, displayed great knowledge of the constitution, and acquired great credit. This was the more remarkable, as it was a subject that had been long and ably debated by the two great political champions and rivals, Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt. Mr. Ponsonby managed the case with less party spirit and less acrimony, and thereby obtained deserved approbation.

Mr. Grattan supported Mr. Ponsonby, and took the same view of the case. He maintained that the precedent of 1788 was incomplete; that the House could not give the royal assent to any act; and could not assume to two branches the authority of three. He would not consent, either, to take from the Regent any of the powers belonging to the kingly office. He would vote for proceeding by address. But the resolution to proceed by bill was carried by 269 to 157.

On the 31st the Minister proposed his resolutions (they were five in number) as the ground of his bill. Mr. Lamb (afterwards Lord Melbourne) proposed the omission of the words "restrictions and limitations." In this he was supported by Mr. Leach (master of the rolls), in a most able and argumentative speech. It was, however, lost by 200 to 224; but on the question as to the household the rising star of the Prince appeared in the ascendant, and the Minister was defeated, on the amendment of Lord Gower to omit the words that vested in the Queen the unlimited control over the household, and to substitute the committing to her the direction of such portion as should be deemed requisite for the attendance on

his Majesty's person. This was carried by 226 to 214; 13 majority against the Minister.

Mr. Grattan strenuously opposed the limitations. Though strongly attached to the rights and liberties of the people, he was always a staunch supporter of the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, and was always averse to abridge them in any particular. These sentiments he showed in his Irish policy; and these he manifested on the present occasion. He contended that the nation had a right to call on Parliament, to give the public the benefit of the prerogative vested in the Crown for their use. The executive magistrate ought to possess all the prerogatives of the Crown; and in the present case, in time of war, this was still more necessary. He thought that the influence of the Crown should rather be diminished than increased; but he was an enemy to the curtailment of its just and necessary authority.

On the 2nd of January, 1811, when the report from the Committee was brought up and the resolutions read, Lord Porchester moved to omit the words "*limitations and restrictions,*" which gave rise to another animated debate; but the motion was unsuccessful. Mr. Grattan gave it a warm support, and concluded his speech with these remarks:—

"I am as well disposed as any honourable member to pay every deference to the feelings of his Majesty; but what are the feelings which the provisions of this bill, and the arguments of the right honourable gentlemen opposite, ascribe to him? Are they not feelings derogatory from his known character, and disgraceful to one in his exalted station? Thus the sacred name of the king has been treated with disrespect, and insulted by imputing to him anxieties, not for the public welfare, but for his individual gratification;—by representing him as awaking from what

has been called "The Trance of Reason;" as inquisitive, not as to the situation of Europe, but as to the state of his household; not as to the fate of England, but as to the condition of his establishment; alive rather to the nomination of his servants than to the calamities of his country; and demanding, not an account of his minister's measures, but a list of his household domestics.

Thus, not content with calumniating the sovereign's mind, by supposing it filled with such unroyal notions, the right honourable gentlemen wish to make the very contemptible feelings they impute to his Majesty the ground of our legislation. They first brand their king as unroyal, and then prove themselves unconstitutional. The best consolation of a sick king is the prosperity of his people. Parliament will abandon its duty if it attend rather to the identity of the king's household than to the competency of his government; and if such a mistaken view of what we owed to our sovereign and to our country shall influence the decision of this night, the monarch will certainly, on his recovery, find himself surrounded by his old domestics, but he will also be surrounded by the misfortunes of his country.

Mr. Grattan to Mr. M'Can.

Brighton, 5th January, 1810.

My Dear M'Can,—I know nothing more of the king's health than you see in the papers. The Minister has been beaten; and the Regency will take place in about three weeks, unless the King recovers in the mean time. You see plainly by the papers that the Ministers have no connection with the Prince of Wales. Some of their friends have left them.

The latter end of the debate on Wednesday the 2nd was interesting. It was an argument about the memory of Mr. Pitt, between Sir Samuel Romilly and Mr. Canning, in which Mr. Canning made an eloquent eulogium on Mr. Pitt; and Sir Samuel Romilly maintained himself with great firmness and dignity.* Did you send the money to

* Sir Samuel Romilly had observed that the precedent did not acquire additional authority from being established by Mr. Pitt. He was not among the worshippers of Mr. Pitt's memory, he was undoubtedly a man of most extraordinary and splendid talents; but much more was necessary to entitle a minister to the character of a great man, and that with all the talents Mr. Pitt possessed, and the great influence he so

Mr. Yelverton for Egan's family.* Hardy's book is greatly admired; it is considered as a most interesting excellent tract; our family have read it with greediness. Remember me to Forbes.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

During these proceedings a difficulty occurred which produced a more unconstitutional measure on the part of the Minister. An issue of a million of money was required for the service of the army and navy. Lord Grenville, the auditor of the exchequer, who was answerable for all sums of money, was pressed by the Lords of the Treasury to sign the amount, which, to be valid, should have the Privy Seal affixed, or a warrant by writing or word of mouth from the King. Lord Grenville declined to sign it; he was urged by the Minister, but refused; and on applying for the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, Sir Vicary Gibbs, and Sir Thomas Plumer, they decided he was right. The Minister was still urgent, and proposed to the House a resolution that it was expedient that the Commissioners of the Treasury should issue their warrant to the auditor for the payment of such sums as the exigency of the present conjunction might render necessary, and *that the auditor and officers of the*

long enjoyed, he looked in vain for any acts of his administration by which he had increased the happiness or improved the condition of his fellow-subjects. After this Mr. Canning spoke and did not take the least notice of what Sir Samuel Romilly had said of Mr. Pitt; but the next day at the end of a long debate he produced a laboured panegyric on Mr. Pitt, richly adorned with all the eloquence of twenty-four hours' research. To this Sir Samuel calmly replied, that if the night before he had in simple language shown in what class he could find an increase of comfort and happiness, the effect of Mr. Pitt's talents, or to what part of the empire he was to look to read "his history in a nation's eyes," he would have better served the memory of his friend than by all his laboured rhetoric.—*Romilly's Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 351.

* Mr. Egan had opposed the Union, but this service to his country met with no reward; in 1806, he too was forgotten—his circumstances were far from affluent, and Mr. Grattan was happy to have it in his power to assist them.

Exchequer were authorized and COMMANDED *to pay obedience* to the warrant. This passed, and was obeyed; and the House of Commons thereby completely assumed the prerogative of the Crown, and so far followed the steps of the Long Parliament by thus superseding the authority of the sovereign. The resolutions as to the Regency were presented to the Prince by deputations from both Houses; to whom he replied, that he would undertake the trust, but stated "his regret, that, in consequence of the limitations and restrictions, he had not been allowed to show all the *reverential delicacy towards his beloved father* inculcated in the resolutions. Anxious to tranquillize the public mind, he was determined to *submit to any personal sacrifice,* and would rely on the *constitutional advice of an enlightened* Parliament." This answer was the joint production of the Prince and of Sheridan; the latter, however, disowning most of it, probably the passages regarding reverential delicacy and filial affection. It led to many injurious consequences, it was made the pretence by one party, and assigned as the cause by the other, of a most unexpected and untoward rupture, and was the ostensible means of testing the Prince's regard for his party and his principles.

On the 8th of January he had sent for Lord Grenville and Lord Grey, who came to him immediately, knowing that the Prince intended to apply to them to form a new administration as soon as he became Regent. In fact, the arrangement for the new ministry were already made.* They

* The new ministry was as follows:—Lord Grenville was to be First Lord of the Treasury; Lord Holland, of the Admiralty; Lord Grey, Messrs. Ponsonby and Whitbread, Secretaries of State; Lord Erskine, Speaker of the House of Lords; Pigott and Romilly, Attorney and Solicitor Generals; the Great Seal in Commission. It was intended that the Chief Baron should resign, and Pigott have taken his place, and Romilly have been Attorney-General, but Pigott refused.

were then requested by the Prince, at the suggestion of Sheridan,* to prepare the answer to the address that had been voted by both Houses. They did so, but it was a difficult task, and ill accomplished. Lord Grenville had supported, and Lord Grey opposed the restrictions. Their composition, accordingly, did not meet with the approbation of the Prince; and he addressed an answer that Sheridan had prepared, and which he altered and interpolated; and this he gave, as already stated, to the deputation from the two Houses. Here commenced the schism that led to the continuance of Mr. Perceval's party. Lord Grenville and Lord Grey being dissatisfied that at the very outset of their enterprise they were unceremoniously superseded—that their draft was rejected, and that of Sheridan's adopted, as they thought — wrote a joint representation to the Prince upon the subject. It was formal, and rather dictatorial, and as if the authors were already in power; and to make it worse, it reflected upon Sheridan (to reflect on a court favourite is ruin, and so they found it). The Prince informed him of this letter; and he exerted his talent and satire against them in consequence, and unfortunately with too much success. He ridiculed their stately style, and represented to the Prince the degree of vassalage he would be kept in by such councillors; and finally, he wrote against them the following lines, some of which might, with more truth and much more justice, have been applied to Mr. Perceval and his party.

The Prince had a high opinion of Romilly, said that he was the first of his profession, and would be a future chancellor; he had offered him a seat in Parliament in 1805, but Romilly declined it.—See *Romilly's Memoirs*, vol. i.

* See the character of Sheridan, drawn by Sir James Mackintosh in his Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 263.

'AN ADDRESS TO THE PRINCE, 1811."

"In all humility we crave
Our Regent may become our slave;
And being so, we trust that He,
Will thank us for our loyalty.
Then, if he'll help us to pull down,
His Father's dignity and Crown,
We'll make him, in some time to come,
The greatest Prince in Christendom."

Sheridan then wrote a long letter* to Lord Holland, explaining this strange and culpable conduct. It was an artful but poor defence. He had first submitted it to the Prince, who approved of it, and it was so initialed by Sheridan. Thus coldness and enmity were engendered in the Prince's mind, and he became alienated and hostile. The Regency Bill having passed, the Great Seal was affixed to a commission for opening Parliament, the royal assent was pronounced in form; and the Prince and the country were delivered up to the tender mercies of their old political opponents. In these proceedings he had Sheridan's head and his own heart to advise him; and these conductors precipitated him to the bottom, bereft of friends of principle, and of reputation. Sheridan completely overshot the mark; he thought he had only *jockied* the Whig leaders; but what he sought as a victory for himself proved to be a triumph for his enemies; and a few weeks after,† he was rewarded by his royal and faithful master in being actually employed to write the memorable letter to Mr. Perceval which finally decided the fate of the Whig party, that excluded them from office, and seated in power the No-Popery Administration. There were other causes, too, that led to this. The Prince hated his wife, and he thought Perceval the best instrument for his

* Dated 15th January, 1811.
† 5th February, 1811.

purpose; and that he would sacrifice the princess rather than sacrifice his place. A low court intrigue, also, had been carried on by means of one of the King's physicians, who represented to the Prince the probability of his father's recovery, and that a change of Ministers would inevitably produce such an effect on his mind as to occasion his death. This manœuvre was seconded by the Queen, who wrote to her son, under the direction of Mr. Perceval, who guided her, informing him that his father had been apprised of all he had done, and had highly approved of his conduct. The weakness of the Prince caused him to give attention to their deceitful statements, and to fall more easily into the snare that was artfully prepared for him.

This event occasioned great uneasiness to Mr. Grattan, and he began to tremble for the fate of the country. He had calculated on the Prince's friendship towards Ireland, and did not think he would abandon the party that he had been so long connected with, in order to continue a ministry whose principles were in direct opposition to those he had always professed—an inferior set of men, who had abused and insulted him, treated him in the most contumelious manner, attacked him personally, injured him politically, and, as they thought, completely ruined his character. Yet what could be expected from a person so weak—he who in the morning could appoint one set of ministers, and in the evening change them for another diametrically opposite.

It must, however, be recollected, that princes and kings have no affection—they have no equals, and that is the foundation of friendship—they are generally surrounded by persons who are courtiers by profession, and who practice and inculcate slavery—they like these men because

they are submissive and impose no control over their desires.

The Prince did not join that party before, because they stood in his way; he disliked them, too, because they were his father's friends, and the feelings of nature were lost in those of interest. His father then stood in his way, but when the son came into his place, the feelings and persons that he opposed appeared in a different point of view, and instead of being an impediment to his designs, they assisted them. The Prince knew that the Whig party would control him, that they would oppose him in the proceedings with regard to his wife; in his love of expense; in his anti-American sentiments, and in his attachment* to Hertford House. He viewed in them a severe didactic set, and feared them as a boy would a schoolmaster coming to instruct, to admonish, and to command. Lords Grey and Grenville were cold and haughty with him; they did not consult Mr. Ponsonby, they did not advise with Mr. Grattan, they never thought of Moira or Hutchinson, they passed over the Irishmen with whom he had lived, and Sheridan whom he liked.

Here, again, the cause of Ireland was lost, her hopes disappointed, her feelings outraged, and her interests disregarded. Mr. Grattan, however, thought that when the restrictions would expire, a favourable crisis would occur which might be managed more judiciously. The Prince always entertained a high regard for him, for he considered him an honest man, he was invariably civil to him, invited him and his family to the dinners and parties at the Pavillion, and to his daughter (Lady Carnwath) he used to say, "*Grattan is my friend,* I can truly call *him* my

* Lady Hertford was the favourite then, but she was soon afterwards abandoned for another.

friend," thus there lingered some hope in Mr. Grattan's mind; he considered the Prince not wholly lost, and he did not despair of the great cause that reigned paramount in his mind. That he was not wholly mistaken will appear from the subsequent events of 1812.

It is to be regretted that the able speakers at the most important part of Ireland's history, should have left scarce any traces of the eloquent efforts they made on behalf of their country. In past times an able argument of Patrick Darcy was preserved; it was delivered, in June, 1641, by order of the Commons House of the Parliament of Ireland, before a Committee of the Lords in the Castle of Dublin—it is an able defence of the rights of the people. The Parliamentary Debates of 1763 and 64, taken by Sir J. Caldwell, who entitles himself a *Military Officer*, afford very inferior specimens of eloquence, though Flood and Hutchinson's names appear there—even in later times in '80, '81, nothing of Daly, Yelverton, Burgh (called *silvered tongued* Burgh) has been found. The celebrated speeches of Mr. Grattan in '80 and '82, were not taken at the time—and the spirit and patriotism then displayed would have been lost to after ages, if every effort had not been made at a late period of his life to collect and revise the materials, and almost to compel him to assist in their restoration. The ancients were wiser, Demosthenes and Cicero took great pains to preserve the records of their abilities and their fame — hence they spoke better, not so polished perhaps, but more powerful, and in particular the former, who condensed so ably all his arguments, and avoided the sad prolixity which is the reproach of modern speakers* — the celebrated third philip-

* Mr. Rice spoke for six hours on the repeal of the Union, and Mr. Brougham for seven upon Law Reform, both bad speeches.

pic was delivered in three-quarters of an hour. Mr. Grattan's early speeches in the Irish Parliament were his best, he considered that he spoke better in the Irish House than he did afterwards, he had a power of command and a tone of voice that he lost in later days; his speeches in the Irish Parliament upon the subject of tithes, are fine specimens of philosophy and Christianity; his Catholic speeches in the English House are condensed arguments, and do not abound so much in the flow and ease of youth; certainly they met with great success; his speech on the war in 1815 was a singular performance, delivered nearly in his seventieth year with great fire and spirit, it caught the temper of the times, and produced an unusual effect.

Mr. Lawless, an active-minded and public-spirited-person, generally known by the name of *honest John Lawless*, had made a collection of some of Mr. Grattan's speeches, and had introduced a reply to Mr. Flood, which had never been made by him; this occasioned some displeasure to Mr. Grattan, and his letters show his anxiety to disclaim it.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, March 5th, 1811.

MY DEAR M'CAN,— * I got the publication of my speeches, but was thunderstruck when I saw a villainous, and ridiculous fabrication by the newspaper of that day given to me as my reply to Mr. Flood†—there was no

† Alluding to modern speakers, Mr. Grattan observed:—"I wonder what speeches will survive. Burke's will, so long as the language lasts, longer indeed, for they have been translated; Fox's will—that on the Peace of Amiens certainly; I doubt whether Pitt's will—I rather think not; his father's will; Lord Chatham's will long be read, yet they are not speeches so much as extracts from them; Bolingbroke will be read and Junius—*that is Burke, a better Burke*: the fault of Burke was he left the region of argument for that of imagination—this will please, but not convince—men will listen, but will doubt. Of himself he said nothing, but he thought well of two on Ireland's independence, two on tithes, and two on the Catholics.

such thing set forth in the list of speeches which was sent to me.

The speeches on the prefatory part are imperfect extracts, they were never taken with any care by any one—but the reply to Mr. Flood is inadmissible—I have accordingly given orders to disavow it. The collection of those speeches which are not in the preface appear, from what I have read, to be very well done—but the reply to Mr. Flood disgraces me—it vexes me much, because they who publish the work are my friends.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

SAME TO SAME.

March 7th, 1811.

When you read the reply, put in my mouth as made to Mr. Flood, you will see the impossibility of my ever having spoken such a one.

I like the book in general extremely well, as far as I have been able to go through it.

The speeches in the prefatory part (for I distinguish that from the collection) were never well taken, however they were made up for me at the time, by I know not whom, but that is no matter; but the reply I am anxious to stand acquitted of, being too scurrilous, and too low to go down to posterity as mine; the newspapers made another reply for me to Mr. Corry. The truth is, with regard to him, with regard to Egan, and with regard to Flood, I was anxious not to permit any extract of my replies, because, in the circumstances in which we stood, I thought it dishonourable.

The newspapers, however, did what I did not, and published for me without bad intentions, such answers as did me more injury, than the real reply did my antagonists.

I therefore wish you would get that reply I write about contradicted, and in such a manner that the contradiction may go down along with the book. I wish the contradiction was published in the paper also; the note I enclose I think would do; it would not hurt the sale, and it would serve me. I send you my speech on the letter of Mr. Pole.*—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

* On the Convention Act then enforced against the Catholics.

All beg to be remembered to you; Mrs. Grattan is better, and in good spirits. Hardy's book is much admired here; I wish it were recommended highly in the Irish papers; he deserves it, and it might serve him materially.

SAME TO SAME.

March 19th, 1811.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—The politics here are dark; there is an uncertainty as to the real state of the king's health. Foster, I believe, has resigned. I am glad what I said on the letter of Pole gives satisfaction. I know not what new taxes are intended for Ireland, but I suppose they must have some, her situation is this———

Her debt is near 90,000,000*l.*, the interest of the debt with the sinking fund above 4,000,000*l.*, her revenue 3,600,000*l.*, her expense about 11,000,000*l.* Newport means to make some statement* on the subject—it is more easy to make the statement than to find the remedy. I did what I could for the distillers, who petitioned, but it was impossible to relieve them.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

On the 19th of March, 1811, Sir John Newport had moved three resolutions:—

1st, That the funded debt of Ireland had trebled within ten years, and was on the 5th of January, 1811, 89,728,992*l.* occasioning an annual permanent charge for interest, sinking fund, and management, of 4,273,000*l.*, and that the ordinary revenue of Ireland had been last year only 3,614,000*l.*

2d, That taxation had totally failed, as the net revenue of 1810, being 800,000*l.* below that of 1807, although taxes estimated to produce 900,000*l.* had been imposed.

3d, That no adequate cause for this can be discovered in the commercial difficulties of the

* See Sir John Newport's motion as to the income and expenditure of Ireland.—*Par. Debates*, vol. xix. p. 423.

empire, as the intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland, the great channel of commerce for the latter has not been impeded except in one instance.

Mr. Parnell said, that Lord Castlereagh had at the Union contributed to all the evils and embarrassments which oppressed the country, his calculations at the Union were erroneous, when he had fixed the ratio of contribution and expenditure between the two countries, he made the proportion of Ireland to England as 1 to 9 in time of war, and 1 to 5 (afterwards changed to $7\frac{1}{2}$) in time of peace, Ireland was paying a greater proportion than she ought, and hence the increased burthen upon her—she was called on to provide 11,000,000*l.* for the national expenditure; yet, after all the efforts made by Mr. Foster, he could only get 4,500,000*l.* in the former year; 3,600,000*l.* in the latter.

The resolutions were not adopted by the House, but they could not be controverted—all the papers were referred to a select committee, and a very elaborate report was produced which remains upon record an important national document, and a proof of the poverty and mismanagement of the nation—the result of this motion was further efforts at taxation, then followed increased defalcations, then insolvency, and, in a few years after, national bankruptcy. Thus it may be said that Sir John Newport's melancholy triumph was in beholding the miseries of his country. Mr. Foster retired from office disgusted and wearied, and unable to effect any good. In his conversation on the subject with Mr. Grattan, he laughed at the idea that the trade of Ireland had been increased by the Union, and said the assertion was ridiculous.

SAME TO SAME.

3rd April, 1811.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—If the compilers publish those speeches I forbid, they will disgrace their publication, and expose their taste, and bring out an advertisement declaring them to be spurious—however, it may have one good effect, it may force me to publish my real speeches, particularly that on the Declaration of Right. Last night the Distillery Bill was debated, there was contained in it a clause prohibiting the intercourse of spirits between Great Britain and Ireland; during the continuation of the Bill, I went to some of the ministers to know whether they meant to support the clause; being assured they meant to abandon it, except so far as it was necessary to give the distillers notice—I did not think it necessary to speak on the subject, farther than to say I was glad that the annual prohibition was to be taken out of the Bill before the House, and if it were brought forward in any other, that would be the time in which I should speak to it. I mention this, because the papers have omitted what fell from me, and it seems as if I was not present.

Love to all, Forbes, &c. All beg to be remembered to you.—Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

In the course of the session of 1811, several petitions were presented on the subject of Parliamentary reform. The state of the representation was so defective, and the conduct of the House of Commons on the questions regarding the expedition to Walcheren, and the proceeding relative to the Duke of York had so deeply impressed Mr. Grattan's mind as to the necessity of reform, that it was his intention to have spoken on the subject, but he lost the opportunity. He wrote as follows:

MR. GRATTAN TO HENRY GRATTAN.

Brighton, 1811.

MY DEAR HENRY,—In the appellation of Parliamentary

reform, three subjects are, by common usage, comprehended; the shortening the duration of Parliament, the alteration of the constituency, and the amendment of the representation of the people: the latter is the real question, because the defects of the latter is the great grievance. I should consider the latter, therefore, by itself, and esteem it a question of right. I think it might be reduced to certain self-evident propositions. By the law of these countries, the constituency, that is, the electors, are the *Commons;* the Commons are the third estate of the realm, and, acting *by representation,* are an essential, integral part of the Parliament. The House of Commons is not the Commons; they are the Commons acting by representation in Parliament; if they be not that they are nothing; whatever right they have is derivative,—it emanates from the electors of the realm,—that is to say, the Commons. If the House of Commons be not the representatives of the Commons, if that house be the representatives, or if (which is the same thing) the majority of that house be the representatives of peers, or of great proprietors, they (that house) are nothing,—they are the representatives of strangers who have no right to elect, and no authority to sit by representation. So true is this, that you could not state in Parliament, without being forthwith called to order, that the lords, or certain great individuals, returned the House of Commons, or any part, and that the Commons did not,—so that such a representation is not only illegal, but the public announcement of it is criminal and disorderly. It follows from this, that when the Commons, that is to say, the constituents, desire that the Parliament should abolish private boroughs, they desire nothing more than a matter of right; they desire that the Parliament should restore the right of representation to the Commons, and the Commons to the constitution. As it is clear the Commons have the right, it clearly follows that the borough patron has none; it follows so the more clearly when he advances his pretensions; his pretensions are founded on long usage, that is, he prescribes for a right to exclude the third estate, and to come in its place. He prescribes for that, the very nature of which is incompatible with private property. That prescription is bad which is fatal to the things for which the prescription is advanced. There can be no prescription in a monopoly of trade,—no prescription for a monopoly of representation, no more than for

a monopoly of the air, or a monopoly of liberty,—these things, being in their essence public property, cannot be rendered private property by any usage or custom. Could individuals prescribe for a right to make a king, or to make a House of Peers?—no, nor to make a House of Commons. The executive, the judicial and the legislative power cannot be elected by individuals; the attempt would be treasonable, and the doctrine abominable. When I speak of prescription, I attribute to borough property an antiquity which it wants. In England this property proceeded from gradual local depopulation within the memory of man, certainly not beyond it. In Ireland the greater number of private boroughs were created since the time of James I. to gratify private persons, or to counterbalance county representation. The advocates against reform cannot stand on such a plea; and there is but one piece of ground on which they seem to be able to plant their foot; namely, the impossibility of the remedy, that is to say, the impossibility of having a representation of the people, which I deny. The thing was done—it was done lately; it was done by themselves; it was done in a few days, without noise or difficulty, in 1800; they themselves in Ireland nearly annihilated the private representation, and left the public: they found the private representation as two to one, and they made it as one to two. Much may be said on this subject, but I must conclude. We shall be in town on Wednesday or Thursday.—Yours ever, H. G.

Henry Grattan, Esq., 11, Tavistock-street,
Bedford-square, London.

Mr. Grattan to Edward Hay.*

London, June 5th, 1811.

Dear Sir,—I was favoured with your request to present to the House of Commons a petition of a numerous body of subscribing Catholics on the subject of the Militia Intercourse Bill. Whatever comes from any description of that body I receive with great attention.

I beg to observe, that since the above-mentioned petition was voted, the Interchange Militia Bill has been ordered to be read a third time, and has, in every previous stage, received the approbation of the House of Commons.

* He was secretary to the Catholic body, their board and committees; an active, honest, and ardent servant in their cause.

The clause in the petition which therefore suggests that "*this is a step to root out the Catholic religion, proselyte the country, and revive the penal code,*" contains against the House of Commons, who had approved of this bill, charges too strong to be presented to that body; and the petition with such a clause is not presentable.

I have thought right to have the opinion of several of the principal persons of both countries who take a lead in favour of the Catholics, and their opinion is, that the petition with such a clause is not presentable to the House of Commons. Mr. Ponsonby and Sir John Newport have authorized me to tell you so.

I beg to observe, that there is in the bill a clause introduced, by force of which the Catholic militia shall have the same civil, military, and religious privileges in Great Britain which it has in Ireland.—I am, dear sir, your very sincere and humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

The following letters addressed to his son, who had entered the army, are not devoid of interest, as they allude to the events and characters of the time.

MR. GRATTAN TO JAMES GRATTAN.

June, 1811.

MY DEAR JAMES,—The home politics are confined to the king's health, the bankruptcies of the merchants, and the Catholics of Ireland. Of the first they talk variously: to-day they rumour that he is not so well, but that he will soon recover, and resume. The prince, supposing his father would soon recover, did not change the ministry: he left them their places, but withheld his confidence. Second, bankruptcies have increased this year to a great amount; the principal cause appears to be the want of a market: merchants and manufacturers had abundance of goods, but no part of the world would take them, or pay for them. South America overstocked—the markets of Europe, except Spain and Portugal, shut; thus it appears that the orders in council have not had their desired effect, and that Bonaparte's interdict begins to affect us. Third, the Catholics. That question arose from a letter of Mr. Pole to the magistrates of Ireland, declaring county

meetings illegal assemblies, and enjoining the civil power to arrest any person who should proceed to elect delegates in the different counties according to the summons for their committee. The question was debated in the House of Commons: the Catholic committee was unmolested, and the counties have not in general proceeded to send delegates to the Catholic committee. An address * was resolved on to remove the Duke of Richmond and Mr. Pole. The foreign questions on those of Spain and Portugal must be left to the chance of war. England has made every exertion, and has sent the greatest native army that ever left England. As to America, that question remains open, and I fear the passions of both England and America embitter in consequence of delay. It is a question that never should have arisen; when arisen, it should have been settled in a month: subsisting till now, it will never, I fear, be amicably settled at all. Mr. Foster, second cousin to the Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer, is going out in quality of ambassador. I hope he will—I fear he won't—bring back the olive.

Don't forget to make the book I mentioned to you,—a register of events, and of the physical and moral circumstances of the countries you visit.—Yours, &c.

H. GRATTAN.

James Grattan, Esq., 20th Dragoons, Sicily.

SAME TO SAME.

July, 1811.

DEAR JAMES,—I hope you will like your promotion;† you will ever have it in view to get to the head of your profession.

There are two questions in the House of Commons,—the Catholics and Currency. Mr. Canning displayed much talent—Mr. Huskisson much knowledge. The minister was, as usual, hostile, and more than usually pointed: he was able, but he was narrow, impolitic, and uncharitable. He generally speaks well—sometimes very well, and seldom, or never, ill; but he is too great a churchman to be a great politician: he has this session acquitted himself expertly, and will leave power if he does

* No such address was adopted by Parliament, but the Irish Catholics desired it.

† He had got a Lieutenancy in the Regiment.

go out with more authority than he obtained it. Foster has closed his political career; it was a various day, clouded not a little; brighter in his own country than in England: splendid at the time of the Union,—obscure at the close.

I have dined much with the bar; they are the best society in Ireland, and are some of them an able and talented set of men; but the Union has had its effects upon them; their conversation is confined to the incidents of their profession, insulated as their situation.—Yours,

H. GRATTAN.

James Grattan, Esq, Sicily.

CHAPTER XIII.

Commencement of the Prince Regent's Government in 1811.—Proceedings of the Catholics.—Mr. Pole's circular letter.—Mr. Grattan's remarks.—Presents the Catholic petition.—Motion thereon, and reply to Mr. Perceval.—Conduct of the No-Popery Government.—Prosecution of the Catholics.—Arrest of Lord Fingall.—Unconstitutional conduct of the Chief Justice.—Convention Act.—Trial of the delegates.—Acquittal of Dr. Sheridan.—Trial of Mr. Kirwan.—Conduct of Sir Charles Saxton, Under Secretary.—Tampers with the jury lists.—Speech of Mr. Peter Burrowes.—Mr. Kirwan found guilty.—Conduct of the prince.—His letter to the Duke of Richmond as to Lord Leitrim.—Lord Hutchinson's spirited conduct.—Lord Grenville's and Mr. Horner's Letters.—Lord Morpeth's motion as to Ireland.—Mr. Grattan's speech.—America, orders in Council.—Mr. Grattan on Mr. Perceval's policy.—Petition from the Protestants of Ireland in favour of the Catholics.—Mr. Grattan moves Catholic petition, 23rd April, 1812.—Speech.—Mr. Perceval assassinated.—Mr. Grattan's letters.—Incapacity of Ministers to conduct the Government.—Record thereof.—Attempts to form an administration.—Mr. Wortley's motion.—Hostility of the Prince.—Old ministry retained.—Remarks on negotiations.—On Lords Grey, Grenville, and Moira.

THE year 1811 was passed in great disquietude. Much was expected from the Prince; much was apprehended from Buonaparte. Master nearly of Europe, he threatened Russia, and sought to add that empire to his dominions; but fortunately Providence was destined to interfere and check his ambition. With respect to the Prince Regent, the people of England were in doubt, the people of Ireland in astonishment, and the Catholics in despair.

At first, the Prince treated his father's ministers coldly, and received the visits of his Opposition friends, Lord Hutchinson and Lord Moira. The former resided at Carlton House, and had an opportunity of witnessing the weakness of the

Prince; how quickly the Ministers gained upon him; and how he weaned himself by degrees from his old party. He lived with his brothers, the Duke of York and the Duke of Cumberland; the latter of whom, since the attempt on his life in 1810, resided at Carlton House. He showed few symptoms of affection for his early friends; no disinclination to a No-Popery Administration; and little regard for the proceedings of the House of Commons. One of the first measures of his rule was to restore his brother, the Duke of York, to the office of commander-in-chief, from which he had been forced to retire, in consequence of the proceedings in Parliament in 1809. Lord Milton made a fruitless motion on the subject in the House of Commons. It was precipitate and injudicious on his part, done without consultation, and not politic for his party. It put the Prince on his guard, and hazarded his good disposition, if he entertained any such towards them; but the Whigs knew his character, and saw that he was lost to them for ever. The subservience of the House was the shield that protected him, and he knew it; accordingly the Duke remained in possession of his office. The next proceeding of the Prince's Government was the prosecution of the Roman Catholics. They had held a general committee, from whence petitions were presented to Parliament, which were civilly received and uniformly disregarded. With a view, therefore, of extending their body, and giving greater influence to its measures, their secretary (Mr. Hay), in January, 1811, was directed to write to the Catholics, calling upon them to appoint managers in each county to forward their petitions. This brought forth the vigour of Government, and Mr. Wellesley Pole,* the secretary, issued a circular

* Afterwards created Lord Maryborough.

letter to the sheriffs and magistrates throughout Ireland, calling upon them to arrest all persons who posted notices of appointing such managers, or who voted for them, or acted in such capacity. This letter threw the country into a state of the greatest agitation. The subject was brought before Parliament, and on the 22nd of February, Mr. Ward* moved an address to the Prince for the production of Mr. Pole's letter. Mr. Grattan severely censured the conduct of the Government for denouncing as disloyal and unlawful a body that Parliament had already recognised, and had been in communication with. The words "unlawful assembly," as applied to that body, he considered most improper. The Convention Act did not apply, as it did not pretend to interfere with the right of petition; and it was necessary that the people should have power to appoint persons to manage their petition and collect the sentiments of those in their vicinity. He observed as follows:—

In my judgment these popular meetings, thus conducted, are not the cause of just alarm. It is well that opportunities should exist for the mind of the people to evaporate. The aspirations of active genius, and the high mettle of young ambition, should not be subject to eternal control. I see much of public spirit in the Catholics of Ireland; much indeed of vehemence; but of a vehemence that threatens no evil consequences. The fire should be kept in its proper orb, and it will emit a salutary light and heat, without bursting into conflagration. Nothing has been stated to justify the retrospective operation of the Convention Act; and if Ministers are determined to persevere in their impolitic system, I hold it to be the duty of the House to interpose in favour of the people, and to assert the right of the Irish subject to complain of grievances. It remains for Ministers to show, that to destroy the Catholic Committee was necessary, in order to prevent a

* Afterwards Lord Dudley.

national convention in that country. It was the undoubted privilege of the subject to be sometimes clamorous and violent in the maintenance of his rights. I will not say it is his right to be foolish also; but I am sure that, with a view to suppress any mischief that may be apprehended, the worst plan is a harsh exercise of the power and authority of government. Occasional ebullitions of warm feelings do not call for its chastising arm; they are the symptoms of a free spirit, the calentures of a lofty mind, harmless when gently treated.

The Ministers opposed the motion, and it was consequently lost; there being only 43 for and 80 against it.

Unwearied and indefatigable in his exertions, Mr. Grattan again brought forward the Catholic question in May 1811; and on the 31st he moved that the petition should be referred to a Committee of the whole House. He prefaced his speech by getting the clerk to read the resolutions of the 28th March, thanking General Graham and his army for their brilliant victory at Barossa; also those of the 20th April, thanking Lord Wellington and the army in Portugal. The following extracts of this speech are worthy of being noticed, as showing the sufferings of the people, the injuries done to them, and their patient and surprising submission. After observing on the arguments brought against the Catholics, he said,—

What, in fact, does this evidence amount to? It begins by testifying that an immense body of Christians, subjects of this empire, are worse than any class of idolators; that they are not trustworthy in civil life. But if this charge be true, then it can be no less true, that the Messiah has failed—that the Christian religion is not of Divine origin—since its effect and operation has been to deprave and immoralize mankind. The charge is compounded of the dogmas of the Church and the politics of the Court; the spirit of the former being uniformly the spirit of bigotry, that of the latter as uniformly power.

Against this evidence we have long had the indisputable declarations, and the explicit testimony, of six most eminent universities of Europe, disclaiming any doctrine incompatible with the strongest attachment to the civil government of every country. In addition to this, there is our experience of the fact, as proved and established in the long intercourse that has subsisted between Protestant and Catholic, and the long obedience and submission shown by the Catholic to your Government. But let us look at the charge in another point of view, and examine upon what ground it rests. It represents that you, having had possession of Ireland for six hundred years, have so abased the exercise of your authority—have so oppressed and misgoverned the people of that country, that they are unalterably hostile to your interests, and inflexibly rebellious to your control. It represents *that you stand as if convicted of a perversion of your power, and practically disqualifies you to be governors, under whose sovereignty Ireland has passed so many centuries of her existence.* But, sir, I believe no such thing. I believe the assumption to be groundless; that it is unjust to accuse England; but such is the nature of the accusation against the Catholics; it points less against them than against England, and British connection. Depend upon it, that the original source of a people's vices is the vice of its Government; and that in every instance since the creation of the world the people have been what their rulers made them. A good government makes a good people. Moralize your laws, and you cannot fail to moralize your subjects.

* * * * * *

The good advice and the sage counsel that is contained in the following passage was wholly thrown away on the British ministry; the error will be discovered, probably, when too late.

Do you not know that the preservation of your own religion, your liberty, and all your privileges depends on the success of your efforts against the French? Do you not know that your success depends on your union among yourselves, and that, if instead of being united, you split and separate, you are a ruined nation? The Government may tell you, you can wait. Yes; God Almighty may

wait, but will the enemy wait? I now tell you, unless you tolerate each other, you must tolerate a conqueror. You will be enslaved and plundered, for confiscation will surely follow in the train of conquest. Thus your property will go to other hands, and you will be a ruined nation. You may be a very grave nation, and a very wise nation; but if in one part of your policy, which is the most essential, you fail,—if you split among yourselves, you are a ruined nation. That one error will be your death,—it will render you incapable, with all your valour, to contend successfully against your foe; but even to preserve your existence as a nation. I have often wished that some guardian angel would descend, and raise those sectaries from the plain of this world, above the little Babel of their own dissensions, and show them the calamities which were approaching; show them, in the continuance of their jarring, ruin visible; show them France, or rather, hostile Europe, arranged against them; and then say, "If you join you may live; but divide, the destruction must be universal."

Mr. Perceval replied to Mr. Grattan rather sharply; he denied the Catholic claim of right; said that those who spoke so often in defence of the Irish were not infallible: at one time they had supported, at another time they had opposed Doctor Milner, and it appeared that they were not only mistaken with respect to him, but also with respect to the veto, for the Irish agreed to grant it at one moment, and refused to grant it at another; this showed that their declarations were not to be trusted. On this occasion he displayed a good deal of asperity, and clearly showed that he was the leader of a no-popery administration. Mr. Grattan spoke in answer.

The Catholic, he says, will destroy the church; and he goes on and states, that if they destroy the church they will destroy the state; and he goes on to state, that if they destroy the state they will destroy the church; for this was the whole of his argument; it was echo upon echo,—repetition upon repetition. He urged no argu-

ment: he relied on the force of his vociferation in place of argument: he had never attempted to prove anything that he said: he said, I think, I think,—and he thought wrong. He had said, he had no objection to the character of the Catholics; and yet, before the Catholics could destroy the church they must be perjured. This is having no objection to the character to suppose them perjured. He had called me the declaimer for the Catholics; I say that the right honourable gentleman is the declaimer for bigots; and if ever there was one declamation without any share of truth or eloquence, it was that speech which he had made against one-fifth of his Majesty's subjects.

* * * * * *

The right honourable gentleman had showed in this a higher spirit of bigotry than he could have expected from a politician; but his country would show him that it was not in the power of a declamatory minister to prevent them from attaining their object. He had maintained that the Roman Catholic, having a religion, was in itself no disqualification, and that if he was free from treasonable practices he stood precisely as any other dissenter who was a protestant. If the first was right, they were right, because their political opinions were unimpeachable. Would they, without inquiry, refuse to admit that portion of their fellow-subjects to a participation of privileges, whose loyalty could not be impeached. The right honourable gentleman had shown no reason why they should be either excluded from the state or the army; but he has shown reasons sufficient to disqualify himself from continuing to be any longer minister of the country.

This just reproof, this prudent counsel, and these noble sentiments were lost when submitted to the minister,—whose rule was prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance. The question was, a sixth time rejected, there being only 83 for, and 146 against it.

The years 1811 and 1812 formed an important era in the history of the Irish Catholics. In 1806 they had been greatly disappointed: some thought that they expected too much, even more than it

was possible to give; but they had not yet made up their minds to their provincial state, and they still retained the feelings of nationality. They felt they had a country, and wished they belonged to a nation. At length they found that neither Whigs nor Tories could relieve them from the penal laws that degraded them, or from the effects of the Union, that prostrated their efforts, blighted their hopes, and disappointed their just expectations. In this palsy that afflicted the state, they only saw a plan to make things easier for the minister, to get rid of the trouble of two parliaments, but not to gain for the empire the strength of the country; they therefore looked, as their last resource, to the prince; to him they turned for protection—for support—for affection; and from his former professions, and uniform promises, they expected more than a cold display of friendship, and they looked for some active principle of good.

With a view therefore to encourage and strengthen a feeling which some of them fancied still existed in his breast, they formed a plan, founded on the constitutional precedents of the realm. They recollected that a convention had restored Charles the Second; that a convention had seated William the Third on the throne, and changed the dynasty of England; that a convention had been the means of obtaining freedom and independence for the protestants of Ireland in 1782, and that a convention had been the means of obtaining rights and liberties for the Catholics in 1793. Fortified by these examples, they resolved to form a body to give them additional strength, and bring into more active operation the great mass of the people of Ireland. They had been reprimanded by their opponents in England

as being indifferent to the success of the measure of relief that was demanded for them;* they sought, therefore, to remove this impression, and, accordingly, in the month of July, 1811, they held an aggregate meeting, and appointed a committee for the management of their various petitions throughout Ireland; but, aware that the Convention Act, which had been passed in 1793, prevented all species of representation, they confined the duties of the body to the matter of petition, (that right having been secured by a proviso in the act) and they prohibited individuals from assuming any representative capacity. The body was to consist of the Catholic peers, their eldest sons, the Catholic baronets, the prelates of the church, the survivors of the delegates of 1793, ten persons to be appointed by each county, and five from each parish in Dublin. In appearance this was certainly a formidable body, but the Catholics were not always in accord, they were scattered and divided; they had a dispirited aristocracy, — timid and servile, —like the protestant, generally standing aloof from the people; till fear, or threats, forced them into their ranks.

The no-popery government now thought it a good time to interfere, and on the 3rd of July, informed Lord Fingal, that a council would be held and a proclamation issued against such meeting. Lord Fingal manfully adhered to his party, and refused to yield. The proclamation was issued, and the next day the Catholic body met, Lord Fingal in the chair, and determined to proceed. The government calculated on being supported in their measures, and that the people would be overawed, but the Catholics persevered, and even a Protestant magistrate wrote to the

* See the debates in Parliament and speeches of Dr. Duigenan and the Tory members on the Catholic question, where this charge is made.

Chancellor, refusing to act under the proclamation. *The chief justice who was to try the case then issued his warrant* to arrest two persons chosen as delegates, and three who had acted as electors; undismayed however by this daring and unconstitutional act of the judge, most of the people in the various counties proceeded to appoint the respective individuals. Members of Parliament and magistrates attended the meetings, in many of which thanks were returned to Mr. Grattan for his exertions in their cause. In the month of December 1811, the body met, and Lord Fingal who acted as chairman, was arrested. The trial of one of the delegates, Dr. Sheridan, took place in Michaelmas term; the grand jury was carefully selected, police officers and magistrates were placed upon it, and some of the most respectable citizens were set aside by challenges on the part of the crown. The well-known police officer Major Sirr, standing in the Court, and as the names were called, giving his signal to the Crown Solicitor. Yet notwithstanding all this management, Dr. Sheridan was acquitted on the ground that there was no proof of representation, and that a meeting for the purpose of petitioning did not mean a meeting under pretence of it.

The Catholics bore the victory with moderation, but the lawyers urged* on the next trial that of Mr. Kirwan, this, however, was put off till the month of January (1812), when a disclosure was made most disgraceful to the cause of justice and to the character of the government, but still quite in accordance with the system by which

* Sir Arthur Pigott said, in conversing on the subject, that it would be much better if the lawyers had not pressed for Kirwan's trial, they should have been satisfied with the victory, as perhaps they might not get a second verdict; he read the speeches of the counsel at the trial, he admired in particular Mr. Burrowes, and told the author that his speech had not been answered.

the no-popery party administered the affairs of Ireland; it was discovered that the Under Secretary (Sir Charles Saxton), had at the Castle given to the Sheriff a list of jurors who were to try the case, and that there were only fourteen names on the Castle list that were not in the Sheriff's panel, there were 115 names in the Castle list, of which 101 were on the Sheriff's panel; they were marked by numbers and by crosses, and by strokes, *which, as sworn to by the Solicitor for the Crown, was for the purpose of seeing "that they were proper loyal men!"* Such was the mode of administering justice in Ireland,—such was the manner in which Catholics were treated,—such the commencement of the Prince Regent's government. It was objected on behalf of the delegates, that men thus selected had no right to sit in judgment upon them, and those jurors were accordingly challenged, and the question was tried. Mr. Burrowes, their able and distinguished counsel, argued the point with great skill and ability—his remarks are so appropriate and so illustrative of the judicial system which unfortunately existed in cases where Catholics or politics were concerned, that it is worthy of being noticed.

Gentlemen—although you are not to decide upon the guilt or innocence of the Roman Catholics, it is a question of much importance to them whether they shall have a fair and impartial jury, or be tried by a jury procured by such tampering as had appeared.

Gentlemen, upon this awful subject you stand in the situation of a jury, discharging similar functions, and I am appealing to you in that character. I consider that you cannot but believe that the Secretary was put in possession of the panel by some management or other. Now I will show you that the panel was most probably altered and influenced according to the list which was obtained by the Secretary. The sheriff himself wonders

at the coincidence of the names. You, gentlemen, have seen various instances in which the order and position of the names have been varied in the panel, from the order in which they stood on the list.

Gentlemen, scrutinize this subject. The panel adopts 101 names in Sir Charles Saxton's list. Why? The Castle approves of them. It adds fourteen new names. Why? Because they are suggested by the Castle. It alters the numerical order of array. Why? Because this alteration is recommended by the Castle. Is this fancy or is it fact? Mr. Kremmis, or rather Sir Charles Saxton's list, has in eight or ten different instances pencilled numbers annexed to particular names. These numbers differ and widely differ from the numerical order in which these names are placed in that list, and in every instance this suggested change of order is adopted in the panel. Gentlemen, these coincidences are not miraculous, though I will admit them to be providential. They seem to have allured the providence of God to bring scandalous fraud to solemn detection, by furnishing evidence which human testimony could not corroborate, or human artifice could not elude.

Notwithstanding this fervent appeal, the triers who were officers of the Court, found against the challenge; and the petty jury, on the very same evidence that acquitted Dr. Sheridan, found Mr. Kirwan guilty—he was fined a mark and discharged—after this the Government proceeded no farther. The Catholics meet, dissolve their body, and form out of it a board, which meets, petitions, and adjourns.

These proceedings of the Government convulsed Ireland, and produced a considerable sensation in England, no one could have foretold that such would have been the commencement of the Prince Regent's administration; yet he followed it by a step more singular still, for he wrote to the Duke of Richmond, to say that he approved of all he had done in reference to the Catholics and the Convention Act — and this letter the

Lord Lieutenant boasted of among his friends at the Castle of Dublin. In another case he showed the feelings he entertained towards the people of Ireland. When Lord Leitrim and Lord Gosford were candidates for the Representative Peerage—he desired Lord Hutchinson to make use of his name in favour of the former, which in consequence was done—but on being applied to from the Duke of Richmond (who favoured Lord Gosford) to learn his sentiments, the Prince wrote in reply that he was wholly indifferent as to the success of either; the Government influence was therefore exercised in favour of Lord Gosford, who was accordingly elected. When Lord Hutchinson discovered this, he acted with a spirit becoming the occasion; indignant at such conduct, he declined all intercourse with the Prince, and never saw him for weeks before the restrictions expired; this vote in the Lords was of some service to the Prince's party, for on the 1st of July, it was given against the Catholics on Lord Wellesley's motion, and turned the balance of 126 to 125.

Mr. Grattan deeply regretted the course pursued by the Prince, not only on public but on private grounds, he foresaw the consequence that the Prince would enlist every generous feeling against him, that he would lose the warm affections of the people of Ireland, that all parties would exclaim against such conduct, and that it could not fail to excite indignation amongst some, discontent among others, and surprise among all. The conduct of the judges* at the trial of the Catholics was generally and

* The Union has here been of disservice, the appointments are political; each party as they come into office appoint them for parliamentary services; their conduct on Mr. O'Connell's trial in 1844 was shameful.

severely censured; the ablest exposers of British law condemned the mode of administering justice in Ireland, and Horner (one of the first men of the day) spoke of it as it deserved. The subject was taken up by the opposition party, as the following letters testify.

LORD GRENVILLE TO MR. GRATTAN.

Lord Grenville requests that Mr. Grattan will do him the favour to call on him to-morrow at one o'clock, to consider what steps ought to be taken in consequence of Mr. W. Pole's letter to the Sheriffs, desiring them to enforce the Convention Act against the Catholics of Ireland.

Camelford-house, Sunday evening.

MR. HORNER TO MR. ALLEN.

Torquay, September 14th, 1811.

DEAR ALLEN,—It is very hard to believe that the transactions of Government in Ireland are not in the same character of a crooked intriguing policy, for the purpose of managing the Prince. Have you any hesitation in thinking that the opposition ought to take up this matter in Parliament in the most decided manner, without any more of that forbearance and reserve which they practised last session.

If the Irish judges support their government in the construction of the Convention Act, we ought to move for the repeal of so abominable a statute, and in discussing it have no mercy on the judges. If by any unlooked-for turn of patriotism or fear in the judges, they should construe the act, as it seems to me it ought to be, then we will have a much freer game to play by an attack upon the administration alone; but, in either event, I feel very anxious that opposition should go resolutely to the attack without any compromise towards the Regent. It is not unlikely that Parliament will meet before the legal question can be decided at Dublin; in that case ought we not to act without any delay, assuming our own construction of the act to be clear and indubitable. I have not the least faith in any stories of secret intelligence possessed by Government as to designs on the part of the Catholics; if Government is sincere, they may have been frightened

by the assurance of a little more eagerness among the Catholics, when they believed the day of emancipation was at last coming on, and the show of a little more determination and system, when they found that day bring them a fresh disappointment. I am much more inclined to believe that Perceval and the Archbishop of Canterbury have worked upon Lord Manners, who is a timid man and very bigoted. The conduct of the Wellesleys in all this business is very pitiful, for they have no bigotry on the subject * * *.—Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS HORNER.*

Lord Morpeth, on the 3rd of February, 1812, brought forward a motion in the House of Commons for a Committee "to take into consideration the state of Ireland." It was debated with much zeal and ardour. The conduct of the Government—the legal proceedings they had instituted, and the tampering with the jury, were severely censured. Alluding to the Catholic body, Mr. Grattan remarked:—

Such a Committee, with regard to Ireland, is more necessary, because Ireland is a distant nation, of whom you have said much and inquired little: her people, their dispositions, their condition, and their grievances, have not sufficiently occupied your attention, nor have they been sufficiently made a subject of your inquiry. Witness the various speeches in the House with regard to them,

* The death of this individual in 1817, at the early age of thirty-nine, was a national loss; he possessed great ability and singular talents; he raised himself by his worth and his integrity alone. In the House of Commons great respect was paid to his memory on moving a new writ for the place he represented. Sir James Mackintosh said—The House honoured the memory of a man of thirty-eight, the son of a merchant who never filled an office or had the power of obliging a living creature, and whose grand title to distinction was the belief of his virtue—a fine lesson this and encouragement to mankind.—See Mackintosh's Memoirs, and Horner's Correspondence, vol. ii.—A monument covers his grave at Leghorn where he died, and a beautiful statue (executed by Sir F. Chantrey), was placed in Westminster Abbey. It redounds highly to his memory that he was mainly instrumental in effecting that salutary change in the Irish grand jury system of doing away with depositions and getting *viva voce* evidence taken.—See his statement as to this, and his difficulty in reconciling the Irish judges to it.

and the monstrous errors by which those speeches are distinguished!

The following is an interesting historic description, and shows the folly of one nation committing to another the custody of her rights and liberties. Self-legislation is life:—

Those privileges are the security of your Church, and those disabilities its danger.

I am the more convinced of the truth of this, and of the necessity of the removing the disabilities that affect the people of Ireland, when I behold the progress of their disquietude. Ever since the policy of Europe, with regard to religion, had changed, and the Emperor of Germany repealed the laws that were penal on the Protestants, the Irish penal code became a subject of discussion, and ever since 1792 a subject of disquietude. For instance, in the year 1792, when the Catholic petition was rejected; in 1793, when the petition was received; and the hostility of the Irish Government rendered acquiescence unsatisfactory. In 1795, when leave to bring in a bill of repeal was refused; in 1805, when their petition was presented, and a committee was refused; in 1808, when their petition was presented, and a committee was refused; in 1810, when their petition was presented, and a committee refused; in 1811, when a petition was presented, and a committee refused; and now is added a disqualification, a litigation, with three-fourths of his Majesty's subjects about their dearest privileges. You go to war with America; you have gone to law with Ireland; the Catholics resort to a new mode of petitioning; the Government consider that mode to be unlawful; the Government issue ten informations against the delegates; the delegates persist, are arrested, and bring three notices of actions against the magistrates, and five against the Chief Justice; the printers publish the proceedings of the Court and the Catholics; the Court issue six attachments against the printers; these twenty-three suits are supported by an eloquent bar of great legal ability and splendid powers of elocution; those eloquent men must, as in duty bound, mark the errors and point out the misconduct of the one side as well as the other; the rudimental principles of

government are put in a course of discussion, and the whole machine examined from centre to circumference; whatever has been committed in history on either side, the conduct of Parliament, and the rights of the people must of necessity form the subject of their eloquence, animated by two auxiliary spirit-stirring subjects — the freedom of person and the liberty of the press. Wait, say gentlemen, for the discussion of three-and-twenty suits, and the return of public repose. Unfortunately for that repose, it happens that the law in question seems formed and calculated for renovated litigation; the best lawyers differ; eagle against eagle, long robe against long robe, verdict against verdict; now a defeat of the Government, now a defeat of the people!

Good sense and good feeling, as a man and a Christian, and sage advice as a politician, appears in the following passages:—

I venture to affirm, that as long as those restrictions remain, no administration, Whig or Tory, can govern Ireland, with repose to itself, or satisfaction to the community. It will be an alternate victory of a Protestant Government or a Catholic people. I am against such victories. I would not enfeeble the Government, or break the spirit of the people. I do not desire the triumph of one sect or the other, but the triumph of both over their common prejudices; and in the triumph of both you will find the consolidation of the people and the strength of your empire—a tranquil people and a combined empire.

* * * * *

You will have this session to pronounce the doom of the Roman Catholics, whether their lot in the British empire is to be eternal disqualification. Sir, you cannot impose it; the very sound is horrible. What! take away the Irish Parliament, and then exclude the Irish from your own! What! use the prospect of admission into this Parliament as an inducement to procure the abolition of their national Parliament, and then make their exclusion from the English Parliament eternal! You take away the Government of their country; you take away the Parliament of their country; you take away their Church, you establish your own; you make them pay that establishment, and then disqualify them! This people, with

their fellow-subjects, pay you in rental two millions; they pay you in commerce, at the current price, near ten millions; they pay you in revenue, six millions; they bleed for you in every quarter of the globe; and you propose to disqualify them for ever! You cannot do it; your good sense and your good feelings forbid it; the feelings of your countrymen forbid it. It is an interdict; horrible, unnatural, impossible!

That you may, in your present difficulties triumph, is the sincere wish of my heart; but as Ireland must be one great instrument of your success, so must she be a partaker of your advantages: she shares your danger, she must share your privileges.

After two nights of warm debate on the subject, the House divided at half-past five in the morning, when there appeared for Lord Morpeth's motion, 135; against, 229. The Prince's friends voted against the Irish. It was said that he got them to do so.

The minister (Perceval) having nearly created an insurrection in Ireland, proceeded to involve his country in a war with America. A recapitulation of the facts may not prove uninteresting. The Berlin and Milan decrees of Buonaparte, in 1806, prohibited the trade of neutrals with England, and were made the pretext for passing the British orders in council of November, 1807, prohibiting the trade of neutrals with France unless the vessels touched at an English port. In consequence, the Americans lay an embargo on their trade with France and Great Britain, and then pass a non-importation act. They increase their naval and military establishments, and call out their militia. Fearing to drive her into the arms of France, Mr. Canning, in 1809, repeals the orders, as far as relates to Holland, and directs the British minister (Erskine)* to treat

* Son of Lord Erskine.

for a reconciliation. Erskine persuades the Americans to take off their embargo and non-importation act, as far as regards the United Kingdom. Canning says, Erskine had violated his instructions,—recalls him, and sends Mr. Jackson,—a rough character, in his place. The Americans re-enact the embargo and non-importation acts, complain that Jackson insults them, and break off all intercourse. Jackson is recalled. Mr. Foster, a young man, of little talent, and no experience, is sent in his place, and Mr. Pinkney, the American envoy, leaves England. The two countries get further embroiled in conquence of their naval disputes, the affairs of the vessels, *Chesapeake*, *President*, and the *Little Belt*. In 1811, the American secretary asserts that Buonaparte had revoked the Berlin and Milan decrees, and that, according to promise, the orders in council should be repealed by Great Britain. Foster (the charge d'affaires) denies that they are effectually repealed: at length Great Britain, in 1812, issues a declaration, setting forth the nature, necessity, and object of the orders, and offers to repeal them when France shall effectually repeal hers. These protracted negotiations become aggravated by an accusation that England had strove to dissolve the American union, and fomented, through the agency of Sir James Craig and Captain Henry, the division of the northern and southern states. The British minister (Castlereagh) denies it; but the circumstances appeared suspicious, and warranted a message from President Madison to Congress on the subject. In conclusion, the orders in council are repealed after Mr. Perceval's death, but it was too late; the Americans had already (July, 1812) declared war against England.

The war is attended with various success. Several divisions of American troops that had

entered the Canadas are defeated and captured. Washington is burned, and the territory of Penobscot taken by the English: but they fail before Fort Erie, and at Baltimore several British frigates are captured: the Americans fight desperately; and in the action with the *Java*, one hundred and sixty men are killed, and every British officer. Finally, the British lose their fleet on Lake Champlain, and are defeated by General Jackson, at New Orleans, with the loss of their commander (Pakenham). Fourteen thousand men were employed on this fruitless and unjust war, and the remains of the army returned to Europe just in time to be too late for the battle of Waterloo. Such has always been the fatality attending British councils where America has been concerned.

In causing this war, it must be admitted that Mr. Perceval was not alone to blame, though in his folly there was more perseverance. The angry despatches of Mr. Canning, and the arrogant manner of his envoy (Jackson) irritated the proud democracy. The English ministers lost their temper, and showed, by the style of language which they adopted, that they were unfit to manage her. They began by the quarrels between the naval commanders of each nation; and the conduct of their officers formed a convenient excuse for an unwise ministry: where courage was alone required, such men were invaluable, but where temper and address was wanted, they wholly failed.

As to the Americans, they deserved credit for having kept clear of the disputes in Europe, and for having not only effected a revolution, but for having formed a government that was durable; whereas the English introduced into the contest the vices of their constitution—the feelings of a

little republic, which are jealousy, and of a court, which are tyranny.

It was not the war of one nation against another, but of an old nation against a young empire, whose destiny was not to decline, but to invigorate, while England retained all the vices of her old age and her establishments. In truth, it was not so much a war against America as against Providence,—opposing the growth and progress of an immense portion of the world; forgetting that empire is never stationary, but moves onward in its revolving orbit, and pursues its destined course from east to west.

The English were quite wrong in their feelings regarding America. Not satisfied with their West India possessions, they sought for more; they carried on an unnatural war, burning the towns, and destroying the houses, and ravaging the American coast,—in fact, making war against human nature,—attempting to force Providence, and giving her precocious existence, at the same time forgetting that America was of the greatest service to them in bringing their goods direct to France and to the continent of Europe, and thus enabling them to sell their manufactures; but even of this coasting trade England grew jealous. Her ministers indulged in the old lofty strain, and talked of coercing and punishing America, never recollecting that England had failed when she was stronger, and America weaker; and now to think that by sending a few troops she could conquer her, was the height of folly: America was sure of success; she could retire, and march back, latitude after latitude, and prolong the war *ad infinitum*, and was certain to beat England by distance, by time, and by situation. It is true, England burned the city of Washington, and destroyed houses, and buildings, and monu-

ments of art and of virtue; but this was a shameful, a disgraceful, and a piratical business: every blow she gave America reflected upon British honour, and every defeat she sustained injured her reputation. She was fighting against the principles of her own constitution,—engaging in a war of passion and of pelf, and entailing on her children nothing but a European war *in reversion.*

In these proceedings, Mr. Grattan took a most decided part against Mr. Perceval. He supported Mr. Whitbread in the motions on the subject, and Mr. Brougham, in his able and persevering efforts to repeal the orders in council; and on the 2nd of March, 1812, he was on that question in the division of 144 to 216. He opposed Mr. Perceval's policy throughout; he foretold the consequence of his measures, and cautioned the Government against the danger of a war with that hemisphere.

In the year 1812, the Duke of Devonshire visited his estates in Ireland. Lord Besborough, Mr. Lamb, (afterwards Lord Melbourne), Mr. Grattan, Mr. George Ponsonby, and several other influential men of the popular party assembled in the south of Ireland, and a great dinner was given in the Black Abbey at Kilkenny;* and there originated the Protestant demonstration in favour of the Catholics. A petition emanating from thence, was extensively circulated, and received the signatures of upwards of four thousand Protestants, of all classes and conditions, expressive of their good-will towards their fellow-countrymen. This measure greatly exasperated the Government. The Duke of Richmond's party was highly in-

* Mr. Goold attended the dinner, and ever after during that administration, was a marked man; in fact he was proscribed in his profession and was never promoted; his opposition to the Union might have been forgiven, but his friendship to the Catholics never was—*his unjust treatment was no secret.*

censed. The Chancellor (Lord Manners), and the Attorney-General (Saurin) found in the proceeding a pretence to gratify their political prejudices, and satiate their passions and their resentment.* However, on the whole it aided the Catholics, and their question was again brought forward by Mr. Grattan.

On the 20th of April, 1812, Mr. Maurice Fitzgerald, the Knight of Kerry, presented a petition to the House of Commons, signed by upwards of four thousand Protestants of Ireland, of large property, and great respectability; and on the 23d Mr. Grattan presented the general petition of the Catholics, and moved for a committee to consider the state of the law imposing on them civil disabilities. He had hitherto avoided making any allusion to the Prince; he knew the weakness of his character, and hoped he was not irrevocably lost to the people of Ireland, and that, on the expiration of the restrictions, he would restore the Whig party; but having now beheld his indifference to his former principles, and his disinclination to liberal measures, Mr. Grattan thought that when the Catholic question came forward it was necessary to allude to his conduct, he did so in a manner least calculated to offend him; and in the expostulations with the Government on their determined hostility towards his countrymen, he made the following apposite and beautiful allusion, not only to the disappointment of Ireland with regard to the Prince, but also with regard to the Union.

Should you, however, finally resolve upon such a measure, such a penal sentence, recollect how much you will be embarrassed by engagements, recollect the barrier is removed that formerly stood against the measure I pro-

* On the 21st April, on Lord Donoughmore's motion of the Catholics, Lord Byron spoke in their favour, his speech was pointed and severe upon the minister, showing talent and reading but with much singularity of phrase and manner.—*Parl. Debates*, vol. xii. p. 650.

pose. However we may lament the cause, we must acknowledge the fact, and perceive that the time is now come in which the Catholics were to expect a *gracious** *predilection*. They were taught to expect that their wounds would be healed, and their disabilities were to cease; *that a great deliverer was on his way that would wipe the tears of the Irish, and cast upon the Royal Family a new ray of glory everlasting*. They gave themselves up to a passion that was more than allegiance, and following *the leading light that cheered their painful steps through the wilderness, until they came to the borders of the land of promise, when, behold! the vision of royal faith vanishes*, and the curse which blasted their forefathers, is to be entailed upon their children. In addition to this immeasurable disappointment, you must consider another—you may remember the Union.

Without inquiring whether the repeal of Catholic disability was actually promised, it was the expectation of that measure which carried the Union. It is the price for the Union; and an essential part thereof; you will now pay the purchase of that measure. National honour is power; in trade, it is capital; in the state, it is force. The name of England has carried you through a host of difficulties; we conjure you by that name to accede to those petitions; should you finally refuse, you repeal the Union; you declare the Irish and the English to be a distinct people; you not only declare it, but you do it; you dissolve the incorporation; they were kept together by hope, and you divide them by despair; you make them two distinct nations, with opposite and with hostile interests; the one with civil privileges, the other without; the one in the act of disqualifying the other; the oppressor and the oppressed. The idea of the Union is twofold; a union of Parliament, and a union of people. I see the union of Parliament; and in that I see the measure which makes the legislature more handy to the minister; but where are the people? where is the consolidation? where is the common interest? where is the heart that should animate the whole, and that combined giant that should put forth his hundred hands for the state? There is no such thing; the petitioners tell you so; they tell you that

* The Prince, in his letter to the Duke of York, said, "*I have no predilections to indulge:*" he fully exemplified the proverb, "Put not your trust in princes."—See Appendix to his letters.

it is impossible such a policy should last; a policy that takes away the Parliament of Ireland, and excludes the Catholic from the Parliament of England; a policy that obtained the Union by the hope of admission, and now makes the exclusion everlasting.

Dr. Duigenan was now put forward to oppose the measure, which he did in his usual manner; the subject was adjourned to the 24th, when it was strongly opposed by Mr. Perceval, who was doomed to speak against it for the last time—he denied that the question was one of right on the part of the Catholics, he asserted that the whole system in Church and State was Protestant, he strongly animadverted on the conduct of Dr. Milner, who had offered the veto and then retracted it, and denied he meant it, yet for this he had been publicly thanked by the Irish Catholics. Mr. Perceval also complained that the instruction taught at Maynooth, was that councils were infallible, that the Catholics in several counties of Ireland had determined not to vote for members of Parliament who would support a government hostile to their claims, that if they had the power they would not return Protestants to Parliament in preference to Catholics;* he said he looked forward to the time when a great change would take place in the Catholics, occasioned by the learning, knowledge, and power of mind exhibited by them, and from the increased liberality of feeling and of spirit. His speech was clever and judicious, but mistaken in point of

* So mistaken was he in this opinion, that after the question was carried in 1829, the Catholics in several places returned Protestants to Parliament in preference to Catholics, and after the Municipal Bill, Protestants also were elected to municipal offices in preference to Catholics in some places, and alternately in others, viz. in Dublin and in Cork; thus the Irish found out by sad experience the true character of their opponents, and that their objections to the Irish were mere pretences—the religious part of the question was hypocrisy, and the political part was power; this destroyed the English party in Ireland.

argument, and diminished in point of acerbity, but it betokened this idea that he knew the Prince, and that there was no hope for the Catholics. The ablest speech was that of Mr. Vernon, son of the Archbishop of York, he was greatly complimented by Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Grattan alludes to him in one of his letters. In this debate there occurred a circumstance deserving of notice. Lord Castlereagh alluded to the blame attempted to be cast on the Prince, by his change of opinion in having held out hopes to the Catholics, which now he did not seek to realize, and added that if such hopes had been raised in Ireland, it was owing to the rash indiscretion and improper conduct of those to whom such communications were made. Mr. Ponsonby upon this replied in the most pointed manner, and stated *that the assertion was false,** that the communication had been made by the Duke of Bedford, and by him in obedience to commands from the Prince. "*I say this*" (said Mr. Ponsonby), "*in the face of England I say, we did receive commands—not merely permission, but actual commands from the illustrious personage to make the communication that such were the intentions with respect to the Roman Catholics of Ireland,* and that he never would forsake their interests."

In confirmation of this, Mr. Whitbread said,—

Who does not know the hopes and expectations that were held out to the Catholics by the Prince of Wales? To him they looked as the polar star of their wishes—the day of his accession to the sovereign authority they contemplated as the auspicious moment of their entire liberation from the remaining links of those galling chains under which they

* This word false, thus used by Mr. Ponsonby, was explained *to be meant in a Parliamentary sense,* and accordingly Lord Castlereagh said *he was satisfied.* The Prince never forgave this exposure of his conduct; it was a *public* conviction from which even the chivalry of his friend Lord Moira could not extricate him.

had groaned through so many years of sorrow and degradation. No one can doubt when this era arrived the expectations of the Catholic was raised to the highest pitch, unhappily nothing but the most bitter disappointment has followed,—a disappointment without ground or justification. The Catholics had a right to cherish the hopes which they entertained. The opinions of the Prince of Wales towards them had been, not only not concealed or disguised, but they had ever been most ostentatiously displayed—it would have been an affront to his Royal Highness, not to have known that he was the protector of the Irish Catholics, and the favourer of their claims. From the Crown, and from the Crown alone, proceeds the obstacle, the Regent has but to will and the thing is done; he has but to will and he will again be the idol of Ireland, he has but to wait and the time will be gone for ever.

The same thing was said by Lord Grey in debate in the House of Lords. And at the time of the negotiations in the month of May (1812), Lord Moira (no doubt at the request of the Prince, and with a view to extricate him) wrote to Lord Grey to know whether he had said, "*that pledges had been given*, a departure from which rendered the present situation (of the Catholics) more galling, and that he said this in the hearing of persons who could contradict him if he was inaccurate. To this Lord Grey firmly replied,—

I then said that the most distinct and authentic pledges had been given to them of the Prince's wishes to relieve them from the disabilities of which they complained, that I spoke in the hearing of persons who would contradict me if what I said was unfounded, and who would, I am sure, support its truth if questioned, that now, when the fulfilment of these pledges was confidently expected, to see an administration continued in power which stood on the express principle of resisting their claims, was perhaps the bitterest disappointment they had yet experienced; and that it was not surprising if, under such circumstances, they felt and acted in a way that all well wishers to the peace of the empire must regret.*

* *Parl. Debates*, vol. xxiii. Appendix xliii.

This fact, as to the pledges given by the Prince to the Catholics, has not been generally known, nor much dwelt upon. The statement of Lord Grey was not inserted in some of the publications at the time, and does not appear in the debate. It affords a melancholy instance of duplicity and dereliction of public honour, and adds another case of mockery and treachery towards Ireland; when such was the conduct of George III., such also of George IV., who can wonder that the Irish people should loath such a system of deception and falsehood, though patronised or palliated by ministers, princes, and kings? it was practised in 1795 — again in 1800 — and again, yet not for the last time, in 1812.* This circumstance perhaps weighed on the minds of some men of honour, and the effect produced was favourable to the Catholics, for they had the largest division that had yet taken place—the numbers being 215 to 300 on Mr. Grattan's motion.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, March 3rd, 1812.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—What you mention about the satisfaction my speech† has given, affords me much pleasure.

I need not tell you what effect the determination of the Prince‡ produced. I was not surprised; I had apprehended it before. I will write to you to-morrow more information about the stocks, as I will see some in the House of Commons who can tell me.—Yours truly,

H. G.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. BERWICK.

April 21st, 1812.

MY DEAR DOCTOR BERWICK,—I wish I had anything

* The Orangemen may now complain of "*their*" Peel, just as the Catholics formerly complained of "*their*" Prince.

† On Mr. Pole's circular letter against the Catholics.

‡ To keep in the No-Popery Administration.—See his celebrated letter to the Duke of York, and Lords Grenville and Grey, in reply, in Appendix.

good to say to you. Can things be worse?—Yes they can. I pity Hardy. Lord Moira's conduct * is not good; but such as to maintain the royalty of his lineage. Plantagenet is superior to modern princes. How is all at home? Providence is more attentive to your interests than yourself, and therefore removes the mitre from your view. We expect three bishops,—King, Bathurst, and Kildare.†

I present the Catholic petition to-day. I long to see you. I will spend some days with you when I go to Ireland, which will be soon, except the India question delays me.—Yours, H. G.

SAME TO SAME.

London, 28th April, 1812.

MY DEAR BERWICK,—The Catholic question has been debated in both Houses, and the Catholic claim has been supported in both Houses by minorities ‡ that promise success. The speeches will be published here. I will send you them. The speakers on our side who distinguished themselves were, Mr. Vernon, son of the Archbishop of York, Mr. Canning, Sir S. Romilly, and Mr. Brougham.

The debate lasted till six the second day. I was ill after it, but am now recovered.

Many more of our friends would have spoken, but the House and the question were exhausted.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

At this period (1812) a melancholy catastrophe occurred, which occasioned some change in the ministry, and afforded another opportunity for the Prince to show his disposition towards the Irish. A third time he was tried, and a third time he was found wanting; and when the bitter oppo-

* This relates to a correspondence between Lord Moira and the Rev. Mr. Orde. Lord Moira had been the voluntary manager of the Prince's affairs during the restrictions, and it appeared that a place had been given to a person of the name of Bengefield for suppressing some writings and letters relative to the Prince.

† The Bishop of Rochester's (King) vote could not be recorded, as his proxy came too late to be *inserted before prayers*.

‡ The division in the House of Lords was 174 to 102, that in the Commons 300 to 215.

nents of the rights of the Irish Catholics was removed by the hand of death, instead of replacing him by a friend, he put there the man who had sold their country, and had basely deceived them! Lord Castlereagh, who had been declared by Mr. Canning to be incapable as a war minister, was selected to act at the head of foreign affairs, and to take the lead in the House of Commons.

On the 11th of May, as Mr. Perceval was entering the lobby of the House of Commons, he was shot by a man of the name of Bellingham (a lunatic), and immediately expired.

MR. GRATTAN TO DR. M'CAN.

London, 15th May, 1812.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—The death of Mr. Perceval, accompanied with the horrid cause, affects all men. Parliament will provide for his family;* how much further they will go I know not. I don't understand that there will be any change of ministers: no overtures have been made to any party, as far as I can hear. The speeches on the Catholic question will be published by Hay.† Lord Donoughmore's is published already.

The place of the Commissioner of Appeal will be raised to 800*l.* a year. So our friend Hardy will now have a reasonable provision.‡

We are all well. I shall soon see you.—Yours, most truly, HENRY GRATTAN.

The Prince now found it necessary to make some change in the ministry, and being anxious to retain the same party, desired the Chancellor to ascertain if, without further aid, they could carry on the Government. In reply, they declared that the endeavour to do so would be very doubtful;

* They granted 50,000*l.* to his family, and 2,000*l.* a year to his widow, to descend to his eldest son, and a fine statue (by Chantrey) was erected to him at Northampton.

† The secretary to the Roman Catholic board and committees.

‡ He did not live to enjoy this tardy increase, but expired a short time after.

and on the question having been put to each of them as to the capability of doing so without the aid of Lord Grey, Lord Grenville, Lord Wellesley, and Mr. Canning, they individually declared their total inability; to this there was the exception of Lord Westmoreland, who had governed Ireland, and of Lord Eldon, whose system had ruled her, and both of whom knew how much a people were capable of bearing. This extraordinary declaration of incapacity was made in a formal manner, and remains on record an evidence of the character of the Prince who continued them, of the servitude of the people who tolerated them, and of the compliance of the House of Commons who submitted to them, and bore for so long the sway of a set of ministers whom they had pronounced to be incapable, and who had actually declared their own incompetency. The answers to the question were as follows: Lord Mulgrave, —no; Lord Sidmouth,—doubtful; Lord Harrowby,—not; Lord Bathurst,—dangerous to the Prince and the country; Lord Buckingham,—doubtful; *Lord Westmoreland,—yes;* Lord Camden,—very doubtful—not desperate; Lord Melville,—very improbable; Lord Liverpool,—doubtful—not desperate; Lord Castlereagh,—doubtful; Mr. Ryder,—extremely difficult; *Lord Eldon,** *it might.*

Such was the opinion the ministers entertained of themselves. Accordingly, by directions from the Prince, a negotiation was opened by Lord Liverpool with Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning, on the 18th of May, but they refused to join a Government, that acted on the principle of keeping the Catholics excluded. No step in favour of his old friends was taken by the Prince until Mr. Stewart Wortley, on the 21st of May, moved an

* Life of Lord Eldon, vol. ii. p. 210.

address, praying him to form a strong and efficient administration; this was carried only by four majority, 174 to 170. He, therefore, employed Lord Wellesley to attempt it. Lord Wellesley had placed no confidence in Mr. Perceval's administration, and had tendered his resignation before the restrictions on the Regency had expired. The Prince, however, had persuaded him to remain in, but on their expiration, finding that no measures were taken to change the ministry, or to remove the no-popery administration, he resigned. He was now commissioned by the Prince to form an administration. Accordingly, on the 23d, another negotiation took place between Lord Wellesley, Mr. Canning, and Lord Liverpool, to induce the latter and his colleagues to join them, but "they declined to become members of an administration formed by Lord Wellesley." After this failure, another negotiation commenced between Lord Wellesley and Lords Grey and Grenville, to induce the two latter to join the former. They agreed about the measures, but differed as to the cabinet; the Prince allowing them to appoint only four members of the cabinet if it consisted of twelve, and five, if it consisted of thirteen. Lord Wellesley to be First Lord of the Treasury, and Lord Moira, Lord Erskine, and Mr. Canning, to be members of the cabinet. On this they broke off;—Lords Grey and Grenville maintaining that such a plan would not form an efficient administration, but merely a balance of contending interests. On the 3rd of June Lord Wellesley resigned the commission, and on the 6th of June a fourth negotiation commenced between Lord Moira and Lords Grey and Grenville. The point as to balancing the members in the cabinet had been given up, and the parties agreed upon the measures, but they dis-

agreed as to the household, Lord Moira declaring that the removal of those officers was objectionable on public grounds; Lords Grey and Grenville insisting upon the point as a preliminary; and on this the negotiation broke off. When this failure was announced to Parliament, Lord Yarmouth, one of the officers of the household, declared that they had intended to resign; that they had told Sheridan of it, in order that he might inform Lord Grey and Lord Grenville; but Sheridan, who was angry with them before, was still more angry now, because he knew he would not have been let into the cabinet; and he revenged himself in consequence by keeping this secret. Being pressed, he was forced to admit it, and made a long, rambling, and weak apology: thus the Whigs were foiled by their own friend, and completly *jockied* by Sheridan as well as by the Prince, who was then left free to keep in the wreck of the no-popery party, notwithstanding the declaration of their incapacity individually and collectively pronounced by themselves,—an incapacity recorded by the Chancellor, and declared by Mr. Canning to have been the cause of his resignation at one time, and by Lord Wellesley at another.*

Another effort was now made in Parliament, but the appeal was fruitless; on the 11th of June the House of Commons negatived a motion of Mr. Wortley's, for an address to the Prince, expressing their regret that their expectations had not been realised, and earnestly entreating that he would, without delay, form such an administration as might be entitled to the support of Parliament and the confidence of the nation; an amendment also by Lord Milton, praying that the Prince

* When the restrictions expired in 1812, Lord Wellesley resigned his office owing to the incapacity of Mr. Perceval to carry on the war, as Mr. Canning had done in 1809 owing to that of Lord Castlereagh.

would lose no time in forming such a strong and efficient administration as might be calculated to meet the exigencies of the times, was rejected by 289 to 164. Thus, in an assembly of 658 representatives, that small minority only was found to oppose such a Ministry.

The old Government continued in power, with little alteration. Lord Castlereagh was Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and manager of the House of Commons; Lord Liverpool, First Lord of the Treasury; and Mr. Vansittart, Chancellor of the Exchequer. Such was the termination of four negotiations, that commenced on the 16th of May, and lasted till the 7th of June, comprising, as published, no less than thirty-one documents, and forty-four closely printed pages. Here ended the Prince's efforts; he thus got rid of his former friends and his early principles. He lost the confidence and respect of the people; the warm affections of the Irish; and, what should have been equally dear to him, his reputation.

In the debate on Mr. Wortley's motion, Mr. Grattan stated,—

That he approved of the conduct of Lord Grey and Lord Grenville, and sincerely lamented the result of the negotiations. As Lord Sidmouth was to fill an important office, he could not but recollect that he had professed himself a decided enemy to the claims of the Roman Catholics; and he thought, therefore, that he was not a character likely to conciliate the people. He was glad, however, to learn that he was not to oppose their claims* in the capacity of Minister. If the noble lords he had

* Here commenced a novel system in the Cabinet, which was termed *open questions*, the Prince's proposition to divide the Council into parts (as already mentioned) led to it; it was a dangerous practice, and afforded a convenient excuse for a dexterous or dishonest minister—the Irish found it to be so, and the Catholic question remained in abeyance from 1812 to 1829—supported by some of the Cabinet and opposed by others. * * * "Wandering each his several way—
As inclination or sad choice
Leads him perplexed."

before alluded to had accepted the offers made to them, they would have deserted their former principles, and deserved the reprehension of that House and of the whole country.

This was a severe reflection from Mr. Grattan on the proceedings of the Prince, and a strong testimony from him in favour of Lords Grey and Grenville. Sir Arthur Pigott and Sir Samuel Romilly also approved of their conduct. But Mr. Whitbread thought they had acted wrong in not accepting the offer.

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, 18th June, 1812.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—The politics of the present moment are brief; our friends out—the old Ministry in; the revocation of the Orders in Council carried; the Catholic question likely to be so. The Ministers have made with the Opposition a division.

The Opposition get the measures; the Ministry get the places. What do you think of that? We are all well, and I hope to see you soon.—Yours, H. GRATTAN.

Now that these events have long since passed, and the passions and interested feelings of the moment are over, it must be admitted that the negotiation was very ill managed. Lord Grey and Lord Grenville should have been more respectful in their letter to the Prince; but they were not anxious for office, and Lord Grenville's pride would not stoop to act under Lord Wellesley. Neither of them conducted the affair with any political dexterity; they were men of talent, capable of giving a proud and haughty answer, but were not beloved or regarded by the people; and they did not know how to manage the Prince. They wanted address, temper, and manner.

The offer that was made was hard to accept, for a cabinet divided into three parties, four, and four, and four, seemed a preparation for combat—and a body rather to counteract each other than

to agree. They wanted an able negotiator, and they had lost Sheridan, who possessed a good deal of judgment, and who could have arranged the matter if he had chosen, and if it were not the habits of Carlton house, for his intoxication and his insincerity.* From what afterwards happened, it would have been better if they had accepted the proposition without two additional seats in the Cabinet, for, even if they had been turned out of office a few months after, they could have granted the Catholic claims, and repealed the Orders in Council—but America was disliked and Ireland neglected. Though the Prince behaved ill, they should not have regarded it, they should have remembered that they were bound to Ireland, and if he forgot her they should not. Had they acted thus, they would have got credit from the people, and served the country, but they distrusted every proposition of the Prince as if he intended to deceive; and, to add to the complexity of the case, Lord Moira behaved even worse than the Prince, he wept and embraced him, and vowed he would protect him against the very men with whom the early habits of his life had been formed, and who were certainly fair and honourable characters. His error was in breaking off from Lord Grey and Lord Grenville as abruptly as he did; he ought to have advised them, that if they were determined to make a stand as to the household, they should delay their decision, and not make that a preliminary point, for if they got into power those officers might resign. He assumed the character of negotiator, but forgot its first requisite, moderation, and instead of endeavouring to bring the parties round, he displayed a disposition that seemed rather military than diplo-

* In 1816, when Sheridan was dying in distress and debt, the Prince sent 200*l.* !! *to be doled out to him in four driblets;* his wife spiritedly refused it.—See Moore's Life of Sheridan.

matic—he kept secret the very point which he knew was the difficulty, (the Household) and strove to restore himself in the Prince's favour—preferring the accommodation of the Regent to the good of the country.* His conclusion was unfortunate, he had refused the Garter at first, he accepted it at last, and afterwards took a situation which lowered him still more, and finally went into exile to a country where he could only make the condition of his fortune more apparent.†

The propositions from the Prince were said to have been insincere,—yet it must be observed that the Household had not been a question in the formation of former ministries—the situations, however, had become political, and were no longer domestic—and the principle of the refusal was perhaps a good one, but the people did not understand those distinctions, and Ireland did not care about the Household, or about Lord Hertford, or Lord Yarmouth, or Lady Hertford; she understood her popular measures, and if these were not carried, the opposition party were likely to be accused as the authors of their failure, and on them would rest the odium. But there was one circumstance that outweighed all others—the power of the Crown had been accumulating for the last fifty years, and had grown so strong that the king would keep in ministers, mistresses, and

* Lord Moira asked the Prince whether he was prepared to give up the household if required, the Prince said he was; on which Lord Moira replied, you shall not give up one of them: thus he sacrificed the Catholics to Lord Yarmouth and Lady Hertford. Lady Spencer observed to Mr. Grattan, "You have no reason to be proud of your countrymen, Moira and Sheridan." The hot-bed of royalty is fatal to the growth of patriotism—it *thrives* best in its native soil.

† Some noble traits of character were discernible, spoiled by the court they flourished in the camp. His prize-money for some captures in India amounted to upwards of 100,000*l.*, he refused to take it, and directed it to be given to the soldiers.

Household just as he pleased, and would not suffer that he should be dictated to in the choice of his servants or the arrangements of his private concerns; besides, he knew it would be a popular argument to use, that he could not permit the interior of his Court to be modified by any minister. The transaction proved one thing, that the Prince could keep in office whom he liked—any set of men, not Whigs, not Tories—but Brunswickers; bad ministers, though good private characters, and could support the worst and most immoral influence against the aristocracy and against the people; it showed how omnipotent the Prince was, and how servile the House of Commons; and revealed the afflicting secret,—the infinitude of the Royal power, and the insignificance of the English aristocracy.

CHAPTER XIV.

Conduct of the Catholics in 1812.—*Witchery Resolutions*.—Mr. Hay (Secretary).—Letter thereon.—Motion in Parliament by Mr. Canning and Lord Wellesley.—Mr. Grattan's friends meet at Tinnehinch, and prepare the bill for Catholic Relief.—His letters.—Introduces the bill in the new Parliament.—His resolutions.—Meeting of the English members at Mr. Ponsonby's.—Proceedings on the bill.—Rejected by Four!—Conduct of the Speaker (Abbot).—Conduct of the Prince.—Mr. Grattan's opinion and letter.—Lord Castlereagh.—Election for Down.—Lady Downshire's letter.—Conduct of the Catholics.—Application to Lord Donoughmore by Mr. Grattan.—Mr. Wilberforce's letter.—Mr. Grattan declines to move on the Catholic petition in 1814.—Catholic Board suppressed by proclamation.—Conduct of Mr. Saurin.—Letter of Peter Burrowes as to Mr. Hay.—Disagreement in opinion between the Catholics and Mr. Grattan.—Their petition entrusted to Sir Henry Parnell.—Roscommon address to Mr. Grattan.—His reply.—Mrs. Grattan goes to France.—Defeat of Bonaparte.—Princess of Wales.—Corn Laws.

In the course of the year 1812, the Catholics met in their respective counties and expressed their regret that the Prince Regent should have continued the former ministers in office, and they resolved that no Catholic ought to vote at any election for a member of Parliament who would support them. Waterford, Cork, and Clare take the lead in this proceeding — the Board address* Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan, and congratulate them on the progress which the question had made in Parliament.

A circumstance now occurred which did much injury to their cause—disappointed, irritated, and

* For this address and Mr. Grattan's reply, see Appendix.

naturally indignant at the conduct of the Prince, they suffered themselves to be led astray by bad advisers, and in an angry moment allowed passion to prevail over prudence. Having met in aggregate meeting in the month of June, they passed resolutions reflecting on the Prince and on his favourites, and alluded to "*the fatal witchery*" which had been the means of intercepting the promised boon of Catholic freedom; these resolutions had been prepared by some of the Hutchinson family, it was said by Lord Donoughmore* in London, and were sent to the Catholics before their meeting, and after a different set had been agreed upon, they were suddenly substituted in place of the former, and were carried on the spur of the moment. Lord Fingall who was in the chair, was taken by surprise, and the interests of the body were compromised by this hasty proceeding ;† factious in the proposer, fatal to those

* Wyse's Historical Sketch of the Catholic Association, 2 vols. p. 152.

† WITCHERY RESOLUTIONS:—

4. That from authentic documents now before us, we learn with deep disappointment and anguish how cruelly the promised boon of Catholic freedom has been intercepted, by the fatal *witchery* of an unworthy secret influence, hostile to our fairest hopes, spurning alike the sanctions of public and private virtue, the demands of personal gratitude, and the sacred obligations of plighted honour.

5. That to this impure source we trace, but too distinctly, our baffled hopes and protracted servitude—the arrogant invasion of the undoubted right of petitioning; the acrimony of illegal state prosecutions; the surrender of Ireland to prolonged oppression and insult; and the many experiments, equally pitiful and perilous, recently practised upon the habitual passiveness of an ill-treated, but high-spirited people.

6. That cheerless, indeed, would be our prospects, and faint our hopes of success, were they to rest upon the constancy of courtiers, or the pompous patronage of men, who can coldly sacrifice the feelings and interests of millions at the shrine of perishable power, or, deluded by the blandishments of a too luxurious court, can hazard the safety of a people for ill-timed courtly compliment. The pageants of a court command not our respect; our great cause rests upon the immutable foundations of truth, and justice, and reason. Equal constitutional rights, unconditional, unstipulated, unpurchased by dishonour, are objects dear to our hearts. They consist with wisdom, virtue, humanity,

who followed him. A moment's consideration would have shown the danger of attacking characters of that description—flatterers, favourites, and meretricious persons are generally vindictive, and seldom if ever forgive. The word "*witchery*" galled the Prince's pride, and inflicted a wound that he neither forgot nor forgave—it festered in his bosom till time lessened, and inconstancy cured it—but the feeling of resentment he carefully hoarded up till it vented itself on the Irish people without scruple and without remorse. The Prince threw out the Catholic Bill in the ensuing year, and put down the Catholic Board by proclamation in the year after.

The subjoined letter from the Secretary of the Catholics, who among others, informed the author of the circumstances, will further explain the subject; it in a great degree exculpates the Catholic body from the unjust charges too often brought against them, and shows how hard it is in public affairs to steer clear of difficulties thrown in the way even by those who are most trusted and most esteemed.

true religion, and unaffected honour; and can never be abandoned by men who deserve to be free.

7. That for the complete attainment of this our constitutional object, we firmly confide in our own persevering exertions, in the enlightened wisdom and growing liberality of our fellow-citizens, recently and gloriously exhibited in their petitions to Parliament in our behalf; and above all, of that overruling Providence which presides over the destinies of nations, and permits not the oppression of man by his fellow-creature with impunity.

8. That, returning with disgust from the gloomy wreck of public character, presented in recent events, we recognise with esteem and admiration the truly noble elevation of sentiment which has distinguished Lords Grey and Grenville, and the other personages who, with them, have stood aloof from the allurements of intrigue, and maintained the high station of rigid independence. We respect their recent conduct, as dictated by sound wisdom, well-founded caution, and by an honest anxiety, as well for the secure attainment of great public benefits, as for the conservation of their personal honour.

EDWARD HAY TO H. GRATTAN, JUN.

Dublin, 52, Henry Street, 27th April, 1819.

MY DEAR SIR,—I received your kind letter of the 23rd, on my return to Dublin yesterday from the country where I had been from Saturday, not, however, before I had despatched a petition and a letter to your inestimable father in answer to his kind favour to me of the 20th, from Twickenham. I was too late yesterday to avail myself of the opportunity of returning an answer to you sooner.

It would be well that the Prince Regent's anger could be mitigated respecting the witchery resolutions in 1812, in which your father had no concern whatever, though most of our parliamentary friends had, in framing them and transmitting them to Ireland, where they were carried by a legerdemain trick, in which only three or four members of the Board were concerned—by substituting the witchery resolutions in the place of others that the Board had adopted on mature deliberation from day to day, a week previous to the general meeting where they were most shamefully set aside, and then carried in a manner that neither the Catholic Board, nor the Catholics of Ireland can be fairly implicated in as consenting parties; for they knew not what resolutions were passed. Lord Fingal and his son Lord Killeen were most shamefully cajoled. I regret I cannot be in London at the discussion of the Catholic question—as this is a point I am so well informed on that I should hope with the testimony I am to produce even in the Cabinet, the Prince might be undeceived, and his friendly dispositions return. The greatest obstacle we have to remove in the fatal impression made on his mind by those resolutions in which your father had no concern whatever—though I cannot historically exhibit the imposition practised on the Catholics of Ireland as well as on the Catholic Board, as but five or six at most of their body was concerned in the plot. Yet the exhibition of the whole truth which at some time or other must be done, I am cautious to undertake at the present moment.—I remain your very faithful servant,

EDWARD HAY.

It has often happened that the intrigues of party have effected that which the most upright advocates of an honest cause had long contended for in vain. Thus it was in the case of Mr. Grattan and the Irish question at the conclusion of the session of 1812. Mr. Canning proposed that the House of Commons should take into consideration early in the next session, the state of the laws affecting the Catholics. His motion was supported by the Government and carried, Mr. Grattan congratulated him on receiving the support of the Ministers, and advised them if they had any communication with the Catholics, not to demand any securities, but those that were necessary and just, and rather to go half way than stand upon high points with an unaccommodating and unconciliating demeanour. Mr. Whitbread said, Mr. Grattan paid ministers too high a compliment for their conduct. The motion passed by 235 to 106, a similar one by Lord Wellesley in the Upper House, was lost only by a single voice—125 to 126.

In the month of December 1812, Mr. Grattan assembled his friends at Tinnehinch, for the purpose of preparing the Catholic Bill, which he intended to bring in next session. Mr. (afterward Lord) Plunket, Mr. Burrowes, Mr. Burton, and Mr. Wallace, were among the members, the judgment of Mr. Plunket, the honesty of Burrowes, the calm understanding and legal knowledge of Burton, and the active mind of Wallace, came well in aid of Mr. Grattan on this important occasion. When the party came to the discussion of the subject, he said, "that he wished it to be a grand constitutional work," and he read the address of the Irish House of Commons to

his Majesty of the 16th of April, 1782.* The spirit of which he thought should be the groundwork of the present bill, a very different way said he of speaking to the Irish people than English Lord Lieutenants had been accustomed to before. "That speech," said Burrowes, "ought to have been read at the Union." "It was made good use of," said Plunket. Mr. Grattan then observed he wished the preamble to be constitutional and conciliatory. A proof that our desire is to strengthen and unite the countries—for which I have a right to take credit to myself, for the minister appears as dividing, I as strengthening the empire. It was then agreed to introduce a clause excepting the College of Dublin, and also to insert nothing as to provisioning the Catholic clergy. Mr. Grattan remarking that it did not follow that they should settle the religious part of the question because they were giving them civil rights—and one reason against such a measure was that the people did not approve of it. A question was then started whether the Catholics would not be left exposed by the Bill, to the Statute of Provisors, and some of the party alluded to a case in Davis's Law Reports; this book was sent for, and Burton read it; it was a case of Premunire, and was considered not to apply. The frame of the Bill was thus agreed upon. "I am glad," observed one of the party to Mr. Grattan, "that you think this question is carried, for my part I almost fear it never will until there is a French army landed on this island, and then England will be glad to give much more than this Bill to retain the Catholics." "When I say the question is carried," said Mr.

* See the address of 22nd February and 16th April, vol. i. "Grattan's Speeches."

Grattan, "I mean the principle is carried, and affairs will soon force Government to concede, but I fear it is too late, the Catholics will never forgive the exertions that are now making against them, getting up Protestant petitions, exciting the people, rewarding the enemies of the Catholics, in fact setting the two sects to fight—both parties are at war—things cannot go on, the Lord Lieutenant is very blameable—it is thus a weak set of men discover their sentiments—really the Irish have never been well governed, never; England can command their divisions, not their allegiance."

The meeting separated, the next day the parties returned to Dublin, and shortly afterwards the Bill was drawn up—it was simple, short, and without clauses, but the oath prescribed was too long. The Bill was good and sufficient for all purposes. If the empire had the hearts of the people, the Bill would have done, and if it had them not, no bill, would give them. It was destined, however, to undergo considerable alterations and additions before it could be considered fit to please the Minister, the Parliament, or the people of England, but to please the Prince (from what appeared afterwards) was not possible—so difficult it is for one country to legislate fitly for another, and so justly punished is that nation that surrenders her* own independence.

Want of information has long characterized the opponents of the Catholics, and has been not less remarkable than their prejudices, hence Eng-

* Great exertions were made by the Government party to oppose popular and liberal candidates at the elections. Meetings were got up against the Catholics. Orange societies were patronised and encouraged; they were introduced among the military; and to such a height this abuse was suffered to proceed, that it called forth at last the attention of the Parliament, and public censure from its most respected members.

land has been exposed to the scoff and ridicule of continental nations, as the answers that Mr. Pitt received to the queries he sent to the foreign universities in 1794, fully testify, and which must have been a severe rebuke to a man who professed to possess a liberal mind and enlightened principles. Some of these difficulties Mr. Grattan had to encounter, and among them was a grave statement that the Catholics had struck from the Decalogue* the Second Commandment. Another statement was, that the Catechism and books taught at Maynooth College were of an immoral tendency, and most objectionable. To refute these calumnies, Mr. Grattan applied to the Catholic Clergy, and wrote as follows:—

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, 12th February, 1813.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—Get for me the Catechism taught at the College of Maynooth, and send it by some one who will come before the 25th, at all events send it. I will write to you in a day or two, the news of this place. I wish to have a Catholic Prayer Book.—Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

SAME TO SAME.

London, 15th February, 1813.

MY DEAR M'CAN,—I enclose a note for Doctor Troy to answer—get the answer so as to arrive before the 25th; we are beaten on the Catholic question, and on all questions I believe. I know of no question that can affect the Ministry, likely to come on. I think this will be a tranquil session.

* Sir Robert Peel made this assertion in the House of Commons. He was well replied to by the amiable Roman Catholic Bishop of Dublin, the Rev. Dr. Murray, in his excellent letter of the 16th March, 1827. The Protestants divide into two commandments what the Catholics retain as the first; the Catholics divide into two commandments what the Protestants call the tenth. In both cases the number is the same.

The Prince has some family embarrassments, how they will end one can't say, but they torment him much.

There is a cry against the Catholics, feeble I think it, and much less than imagined—let me hear from you—send me now and then, an Irish paper—remember me to Forbes.—Yours, truly,

H. GRATTAN.

At the general election which had taken place in the preceding October, Mr. Grattan had been a fourth time chosen one of the representatives of the city of Dublin, and he hastened to try the sense of the new parliament on the Irish question—accordingly, on the 25th of February, he moved that the House should resolve itself into a committee to take into its most serious consideration, the state of the laws affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, with a view to such a final and conciliatory adjustment as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, to the stability of the Protestant establishment, and to the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of his Majesty's subjects.*

After two nights hard debating, this motion was carried by 264 to 224, and on the 9th of March, the House resolved itself into a committee,† when Mr. Grattan moved another

* Mr. Plunket distinguished himself by his ability in this debate. Sir James Mackintosh, in one of his letters, says, "Plunket's admirable speech has made more impression than any speech since Sheridan's in 1817, on the charge against Hastings. It is, I believe, the only speech which is certainly well known to have determined the votes of several individuals; was a direct and sole cause of the votes of two Scotchmen, Mr. A. and H. The last is enthusiastic in his admiration for Mr. Plunket, and in his zeal for the Catholics." — *Mackintosh's Memoirs.*

† "That with a view to such an adjustment as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, to the security of the Established Church, and to the ultimate concord of all classes of his Majesty's subjects, it is highly advisable to provide for the removal of the civil and military disqualifications under which his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects now labour, with such exceptions and under

resolution declaratory of the character of the measure, with a view to allay the apprehensions entertained against it by scrupulous but well meaning individuals. This, too, was carried by 186 to 119. Leave was given to bring in the bill, and Mr. Grattan and Mr. Ponsonby were appointed for the purpose; on the 12th of April, it was brought up and read a first time, printed and ordered to be read a second time on the 11th May. As much controversy arose about this measure, and many complaints were made with respect to the Bill, it is necessary to observe that Mr. Grattan brought it in simple and unrestricted, and with only two exceptions, the offices of Lord Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor, the former was by law necessarily Protestant, the latter, in which there was much Church patronage, could not be filled by a Catholic. Mr. Grattan did not introduce any clauses; they were proposed by Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh, in order to satisfy the British community. The following is a correct history of the proceeding: Sir John Newport had written a letter to the Rev. Mr. Power, Catholic Bishop of Waterford, submitting some clauses to him for his opinion. Mr. Grattan told him that they would not be liked in Ireland, and that the Catholic clergy would exclaim against them; however, Bishop Power in his reply very nearly approved of the clauses with only a slight variation. The bishop communicated the circum-

such regulations as may be found necessary for preserving unalterably the Protestant succession to the crown, according to the act for the further limitation of the crown and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject, and for maintaining inviolable the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof; and the Church of Scotland, and the doctrine, worship, and discipline, and government thereof, as the same are respectively by law established."

stance to Dr. Milner, who wrote a letter against the clauses, and this was circulated by the Anti-Catholic party prior to the discussion, and was used as an argument against the measure by its opponents. Mr. Canning took up Sir John Newport's idea, and enlarged upon it, and showed his clauses to Mr. Wilberforce, as it was necessary to have his party in order to carry the measure. A meeting was then fixed to be held at Mr. Ponsonby's on the 20th April, for the purpose of discussing them. Wilberforce went there with Mr. Canning, and met Lord Donoughmore, Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Elliot, Sir John Newport, Sir Arthur Pigott, and Sir Samuel Romilly. Lord Donoughmore, Mr. Ponsonby, and Mr. Grattan, disapproved of the clauses, but as it was stated, they were requisite to carry the measure, they were of necessity adopted. Lord Castlereagh then said he would propose new clauses which were to give the Crown greater power in the appointment of the bishops, as Mr. Canning's gave to the laity. Mr. Grattan knew these would not be liked, and he with others expressed his opinion against them; but he supported them because he wished to carry the bill, and he could not carry it without the Government, and the government would not assist him without the clauses. He went every practicable length, adhering to the principle, knowing that when the great measure was carried the rest would follow. He attached no importance to the clauses or to the securities, but he said he would rather pass the bill with them than not pass it at all.

On the day appointed for the second reading, Mr. Canning presented his clauses which were ordered to be printed; a motion for delay was then proposed by Sir John Cox Hippisley, a very

worthy man, but whose head was full of religious lumber—the decrees of the Councils—the writings of the fathers — the bulls of the Popes, formed in his mind an inextricable labyrinth, into the mazes of which he sought to introduce the House, and prayed for an inquiry, not only into the nature of the securities offered by the Catholics, but into their intercourse with the See of Rome, this was opposed by Mr. Grattan, and Mr. Canning, (the latter in a very humorous speech,) and was rejected by 235 to 287. The bill was read a second time on the 13th May, after a division of 245 to 203. And on the 19th, the committee sat and additional clauses were presented, and an adjournment took place to the 24th. Meantime the storm was collecting, the Prince and his friends were active. A letter of Dr. Milner against the bill was circulated among the members, and when the House went into the committee, the Speaker (Abbot)* proposed to omit the clause which allowed Catholics to sit and vote in Parliament—in fact to nullify the measure and throw out the bill. This amendment was opposed by Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, and (as Mr. Grattan thought) with great sincerity, the opponents of the measure advanced as an argument against the bill, that the Catholics were not pleased with it, and would not accept it. This Mr. Grattan denied and spoke with much energy and spirit on the occasion.

If you vote against this clause, you vote against the Bill, you nullify your object, you falsify your pledge.

* This was a narrow-minded, cunning, active, intriguing little gentleman. He signalised himself, at the outset of his career, by speaking against Mr. Fox, who was the butt that all young men were desired to shoot their arrows at. He spoke wretchedly, and made no impression; but he effected his object; and his exertions got him the chair, though not the ear of the House.

The noble lord opposite (Castlereagh) has acted a manly part, let the noble lord share then the merit of the bill. Upon my head be the odium of the clauses. To insure the principle of omission I shall submit to the minor infringements. The alleged unpopularity of the bill can only be temporary. Should the Catholic mind be indisposed to accept it, should their leaders inculcate hostility to its clauses, clauses so necessary to carry through its principle, why then I shall lament such an occurrence; I shall feel it bitterly; I shall then indeed admit that the Catholics are the bitterest enemies of themselves, and that upon their own heads only can the consequences of their own folly rest.

You stand between two important opinions. The one leads to unanimity in the nation, the other to discord in the community. The one incorporates the Catholic with the Protestant, and limits, nay, extinguishes, the power of the Pope. The other exasperates the feelings of the people, and saps the best securities of the empire. The one lays at your disposal a brave and generous people, to testify on the embattled plain the allegiance and the gratitude they owe you, and place your country on an iron pedestal, never, never, to be shaken. The other arms you with what? The Pope and his visions at your back, and with these banners to advance against and appal the almost overwhelming enemy of Europe.

The House divided on the Speaker's amendment; for it, 251; against it, 247;—majority against the Catholics, 4. Mr. Ponsonby then stated, that, as the leading clause was negatived, the measure was lost,* and the bill was accordingly withdrawn.

* The way the bill was thrown out was this: Lord Ormond, one of the lords of the bedchamber, was dissatisfied at not being allowed to nominate to the shrievalty of Kilkenny, a right his family had long exereised, and which was now given to Lord Desart. He accordingly resigned his situation. The Prince gained four members over, and got Lord Graves to turn the question; and said, that if the bill came to the Lords, he would create six peers to throw it out. In fact, he was more hostile to them than his father. See his expressions on the passing of the bill in 1829, as stated in Lord Eldon's "Memoirs," vol. iii., that he would not create any Catholic peers; though the law should allow it, that he would be no party to the act; on the head of the ministers the responsibility would rest.

An anecdote is related of Wilkes, that showed he was a good judge

For his exertions on this occasion, Mr. Grattan received the thanks* of the British and the Irish Roman Catholic Boards, and from meetings in various parts of the country; but, notwithstanding, he was greatly affected at the loss of the measure, and much concerned, also, at the resolutions that had been passed, reflecting upon the Prince. He said he considered the question to be now *hitched;* that it had gone on too long. "I fear that all is now over; emancipation will come too late. The Prince will not forgive the Catholics the resolutions they passed. The 40*s.* freeholders will be struck off. It is a thing that I have long foreseen; something calamitous will occur. The worst of the delay is, that the people will fix on some other question. I cannot, however, blame the Catholics for their violence, when I recollect what the Protestants did in 1783. Their leaders are not as violent as the Bishop of Bristol was then. These men have got nothing, whereas the others had obtained their constitution. The one party acted ill under success, the others imprudently under disappointment."

He communicated the intelligence to Ireland in the following letter:—

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. M'CAN.

London, 25th May, 1813.

The question was lost last night. My speech was very short and very ill taken. They have made me say that if the Catholic clergy opposed the clauses, they would be enemies to the community.

I could say no such thing; but said that if the bishops

of character. Dining one day, in company with the Prince, he was asked to sing a song. He declined. The Prince insisted; upon which he said he knew but one song; and sung "God save the King." The Prince asked, "Why, how long, Wilkes, have you been in the habit of singing that?" "Oh, sir," replied Wilkes, "ever since I had the honour of knowing your Royal Highness!!"

* See Vol. v. Grattan's Miscellaneous Works, p. 326.

opposed those clauses, they would be the cause of the loss of the bill, and do an injury to their community.

I shall send you to-morrow what I said.—Yours truly,

H. GRATTAN.

An event occurred in 1812, which, for the sake of the character of Ireland, requires explanation. Lord Castlereagh was elected for the county of Down. It must appear strange that an individual who had acted the part he did towards his country, should have been selected as one of her representatives, and for a county inhabited by sturdy Presbyterians and Church of England men, who had been driven among the first into a state of insurrection in '97 and '98, in consequence of his violent measures, and those of the Government with which he acted. His return was obtained by manœuvre, and by an artifice practised on the simplicity of a young nobleman (Lord Downshire), the representative of a family that had for years opposed him, and had expended upwards of 60,000*l.* in turning him out of the county. Mr. Savage had been the popular member, and he was ousted by the dexterity of Lord Castlereagh; the opinion of the electors was not taken, Mr. Savage declined a contest, and Lord Castlereagh was returned by thirty-seven votes. Lady Downshire Sandys' was much mortfiied by this circumstance, and wrote the following explanation to Mr. Grattan, which a debt of justice due to her memory, and to the people of Ireland, causes to be here inserted:—

LADY DOWNSHIRE SANDYS TO MR. GRATTAN.

Hillsborough, Nov. 2, 1812.

MY DEAR SIR,—I cannot resist intruding upon your attention for a few moments with a subject that very nearly concerns me, and which I venture to hope may interest and gratify you. I allude to the state of politics

in this county. Before you receive this you will probably have learned the (to me very mortifying) fact that Lord Castlereagh is returned for this county—he is placed in that situation in consequence of an unfortunate correspondence that passed between Downshire and Lord Londonderry, in which Downshire, aware that he commanded the return of both members, yet was determined to prevent as far as he could the violent evils of a contested election here, and therefore resolved to make private interest bow to public good, by informing Lord Londonderry that he did not at this election intend to interfere with the second seat; all must applaud the motive here, but I am sure you will join with me in lamenting the effect of that motive, in this instance. On my arrival here lately to officiate as god-mother to D.'s little boy, I found all D.'s friends deeply lamenting (and in consequence their attachment shook by) the neutrality in which D. had placed himself as to Lord Castlereagh's election. There was not a moment to be lost, it was too late; it was impossible to have opposed Lord Castlereagh on this occasion without running the risk of D.'s honour; opposition on this occasion was therefore out of the question. I advised D. immediately after the election to call a meeting of his friends, and to state to them his sincere regret, at having any correspondence with Lord Londonderry upon the subject of county politics, and to declare to them his motive for entering into that correspondence, and to assure them that there was no tendency to a compromise of public principles on his part with the Stewarts, that there was no political sympathy between them, and that he was resolved to support and maintain the independence of the county to the last; he did so upon Monday the 26th ultimo, and it had more than the desired effect, it restored confidence, it animated hope, it cemented the predominant strength of his friends, and it has again placed him at the head of this county as well in popularity as in power; and I have the satisfaction to tell you that I firmly believe this to be the last time of Lord Castlereagh being where he now is.

My son Arthur has begun his canvass to represent the county upon the first vacancy after he comes of age in January; and I am very happy to say he is popular in himself and very successful in his canvass. I trust you will forgive this intrusion which you must attribute to my

partiality to you, and if you are inclined to be displeased with me for the trouble which I give you, you must refer it to the deference I have for your judgment, and the veneration I feel for your sanction. I saw you and your son* were at your posts at Kilkenny, and I am happy to find that the name of *Grattan* will not be diminished in descending to your son.

I beg to present my love and complements to Mrs. Grattan and your daughters. It will give me very sincere pleasure to hear a good account of Mrs. Grattan. With every sentiment of respect and esteem,

I remain, my dear Sir,

Your obliged and faithful humble servant,

M. DOWNSHIRE SANDYS.

The disappointment which the Catholics felt at the loss of their measure began to manifest itself at the close of the year 1813; some of the active members of their Board expressed their dissatisfaction that the Catholic lawyers had not been consulted on the formation of the Bill; and some of the clergy declared that the Bill tended to produce a schism in their church. However, the moderate and higher classes in general approved of it. In the month of November the Board opened a correspondence with Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan, to ascertain if they would receive a communication from their body as to the formation of a bill, and in reply these individuals declined anything that look like dictation to Parliament. In the month of December the Board renewed the application, declaring it had no intention to dictate, and expressed a hope, "that personages to whom they were so justly grateful, would not declare they cannot condescend to receive instructions from the Catholics of Ireland." To this Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan answered—that if the communication was not in

* At the dinner at the Black Abbey in Kilkenny, the author spoke on the question that agitated the country.

the nature of instructions, they agreed, and would receive their suggestions on the subject.*

Uninfluenced by any desire except that of carrying a measure that was of use to his country, and regardless of popular clamour or unmerited aspersions, Mr. Grattan, though of opinion that the question could not be brought forward in the session of 1814 with any hope of success, yet thought it right to consult the friends of the Catholics in England, and they confirmed him in the opinion that the petition should not be moved on. He requested a meeting of their parliamentary supporters, and the following was Mr. Wilberforce's reply to his application :—

MR. WILBERFORCE TO MR. GRATTAN.

Kensington Gore, April 30, 1814.

MY DEAR SIR,—Mr. Canning having mentioned to me that he was to confer with you this morning concerning the propriety of bringing forward the Catholic question this year, and having told me that you had done me the honour to express a wish that I should be present, I should have been happy to attend you, but for my happening to be engaged all the morning on some business very important and very urgent, to which this morning has been for for some days allotted, and for which it would be difficult for me to find another.

I own also that I am less anxious than I otherwise should be to assist in your conference this morning, because I own I am in dread that, under all the circumstances of the times and case—with reason or without it—we should divide far weaker than in the last session, and consequently should lose ground instead of obtaining any benefit. As I am extremely pressed for time, excuse my only adding that I am, with respect and regard, my dear Sir, your faithful servant,

W. WILBERFORCE.

On the 27th of May (1814), Mr. Grattan presented the petition from the Roman Catholics of

* See Appendix for this correspondence.

Ireland, and stated that he would not move or bring on any discussion. "Substantial difficulties had been removed, but his reasons were founded on present circumstances; he would not enter into the detail, lest any proposition should throw back a question whose ultimate success could alone be prevented by precipitation." He said "he would pursue the cause with ardour, and in the way which appeared to him most practicable."

The Government now availed themselves of the altercations between the Catholic Board and their friends, and thought it a good opportunity to put down the body, and accordingly Lord Whitworth commenced his administration by a proclamation suppressing it. Previous to this every effort was made to keep alive the Orange spirit that had been patronised by the Duke of Richmond, and that was still upheld by the Secretary, Mr. Robert Peel, and the Attorney-General, Mr. Saurin—the latter of whom had declared, in a most unconstitutional manner, and one most unbecoming a law officer of the Crown, that he would allow the Board to go on as long as it did mischief to its cause, and that its folly exceeded its illegality. The prejudices of this person—his prosecutions of the press—his encouragement of the Orange party revived the discord that unhappily existed between Protestant and Catholic, and which had in a great degree began to subside. It has generally happened that when a party in the British Ministry appeared favourable to the Catholics, a party in the Irish Government was got up against them—the friends and partisans of the Roman Catholics were stigmatized, and their characters blackened, by the body that kept them excluded from the enjoyment of their just and natural rights. Thus it happened that

the Catholics were assailed through their Secretary, Mr. Edward Hay, whose character was misrepresented to Mr. Grattan; and as the following letter refutes the unmerited charge against him, out of justice to his memory it is here inserted:—

MR. PETER BURROWS TO MR. GRATTAN.

13th April, 1814.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—I was one of Edward Hay's counsel, upon his trial for high treason, immediately after the Rebellion of 1798, in the County of Wexford. So was Bushe, our present Solicitor-General, who no doubt would agree in all I state; no part of it will be questioned by any man who can speak from knowledge. He was acquitted, without a moment's delay, by twelve Protestant persons. Sir Michael Smyth, the judge who presided at his trial, commenced his charge with these remarkable words:—"I am happy that it has fallen to my lot to put an end to the sufferings of this unfortunate gentleman." He said that Hay did not require the Amnesty Act to protect him. This must have been so; for if he was guilty of treason, it must have been (and so the statement and evidence against him purported to establish) as a leader, and leaders were expressly out of the pardon of the Amnesty Act. At the time Hay was acquitted, the prejudice was so strong against Roman Catholics, that I would not allow Hay to examine any witness of that persuasion, and I have no doubt but that every juror believed him guilty before trial; and, from the influence of prejudice, anxiously wished that he should be executed. Hay had been treated with great cruelty, in the interval between his arrest and trial, by the persons who principally managed the trial. It was this that brought forth the observation with which Baron Smith commenced his charge.

Thomas Cloney also will probably be attacked as an atrocious rebel; no doubt he was implicated and condemned by the casting vote of the president of a court-martial. This condemnation was *instantly* reversed by Lord Cornwallis; and as soon as it could be done without hurting the feelings of the County of Wexford Protestants, he obtained a free pardon.

Cloney was distinguished during the Rebellion by repeated acts of hazardous humanity; it really appeared as if he solicited command principally to control barbarous excesses. No man could now read the minutes of his trial, without feeling that if any rebel ought to be spared, Thomas Cloney was that man. I cannot, however, but condemn the folly of those who put him forward as an agent of the Catholic cause; he was himself much to blame in taking any forward part in politics. But it appeared to me that the late ostensible managers of Catholic affairs would be glad to furnish your adversaries with topics injurious to the cause you advocate.—Ever truly yours,

PETER BURROWS.

Though the Catholic Board had been suppressed, that body continued to act by means of aggregate meetings; and, in September 1814, the Catholics of the County and City of Cork requested that Mr. Grattan would present their petition to Parliament, in case he would pay attention to the instructions of the petitioners. He declined to accept it under that stipulation; but added that he was ever ready to pay attention to their right of free communication, and to his right of free judgment. With this reply they were satisfied, and the petition was confided to him; but with the Catholics in Dublin the case was different, and a breach here took place which was of little service to the cause. Lord Donoughmore had written to that body, in January 1815, that as it was made matter of debate among them, whether he should be intrusted for the future with the care of their petition, he begged to withdraw himself from any share in the management of their appeals to Parliament. An application was afterwards made to him, and to Mr. Grattan, to present the petition, but with this addition, that if they did not agree in opinion with their body, as to the discussion thereon in that session,

that they should decline to present it. Lord Donoughmore replied, that as there appeared "no endeavour to limit the free exercise of his judgment, he would accept the proof of renewed confidence." Mr. Grattan's answer was different. He said "that it was impossible for him to make a previous declaration of his opinion as a stipulation for the honour of presenting their petition." He added—"my attachment to the claims of the Catholics is known—my constancy is unquestionable; should you give me your petition, I shall most willingly present it; should you entrust it to another, my struggles and my perseverance for the claims of the Roman Catholics shall never on that account be diminished—my zeal in their cause shall remain unabated." In consequence of this answer, the petition was entrusted to Sir Henry Parnell.

Thus ended for a time the connexion between Mr. Grattan and the Catholics; on their part, it was injudicious and unnecessary. Some considered it to be unwise, others ungrateful: it was of no service to their cause in Ireland, and was prejudicial to them in England. The Catholics of the County of Roscommon presented an address to him on the subject, and animadverted on the slight that he had been treated with; but in his reply, he touched on this point with that feeling and dignity that marked his conduct, in all the differences he had with the people; he quietly replied—"I have no reason to complain of the Catholics, least of all have I any justification to lessen my zeal in their favour,—their cause is the cause of the empire."

In these proceedings Mr. Grattan's conduct was remarkable. He did not fear to risk his popularity, and would not yield to the Catholic Board in 1815, on the matter of their petition,

just as he would not yield to the Protestants, in 1783, on the question of simple repeal, and as he would not yield to the Orange party in 1798, on the question of torture—he considered these cases with reference to the Parliament and the people, and thought they were dictatorial, tyrannical, and sanguinary—he resisted the popular clamour with stedfastness, and not without hazard at the time both to life and reputation. In these contests with the people, posterity will pronounce him in the right, and justice will be done to his memory. Perhaps it was the result of his foresight, or as likely the effect of accident.

Mr. Grattan's spirits began now to revive—public affairs had improved—the Continent made a rally against Buonaparte—he had been driven from Russia by the valour of the people, aided by the inclemency of the climate, both of which combined to annihilate the armies of France. The Duke of Wellington had advanced from Spain, entered the French territory, and proceeded to Toulouse—the allied troops of Prussia, Austria, and Russia, notwithstanding the able tactics and consummate skill displayed by Napoleon in the campaign of 1814, had approached the gates of the capital, and, on the 20th March, the battle of Paris decided the fate of his dynasty, and from the palace of Fontainbleau, he was led captive to his exile—the sovereignty of the Island of Elba.

These events removed from Mr. Grattan's mind the apprehensions of danger, which he always considered as most imminent to Ireland from the French quarter. He thought that the empire was safe for the present, and the Catholic question secured for the future. The illness of Mrs. Grattan had considerably increased of late, and the opportunity of peace presenting itself, she was

persuaded to try the climate in the south of France, and proceeded to the waters at Barèges, where she remained with her younger daughter until the return of Bonaparte in 1815. Meanwhile Mr. Grattan retired to Tinnehinch, where he enjoyed the society of his early friends, Judge Day, Mr. Plunket, Burrows, Burton, Curran, Goold, Wallace, Berwick, &c. &c. His eldest daughter had married an accomplished and agreeable person,* John Blachford of Altadore, in the County of Wicklow, brother of Mrs. Henry Tighe, the authoress of "Psyche," and, like her, possessed of much ability, and a great love of literature.

From this time Mr. Grattan began to relax somewhat from politics, and gave himself up to reading and the society of his friends; he applied his mind to the perusal and study of French literature, and translated into that language some of the tales by Miss Edgeworth. Attendance on Parliament had grown onerous to him, and he did not take an active part in the debates; but when the case of the Princess of Wales came before the House, he exerted himself to reconcile the jarring interests between her and the Prince. She had paid great court to Mr. Grattan, and strove all in her power to enlist him in her cause. He considered her an ill-treated personage, and that it was the duty of the House to protect her. The Prince Regent having declared to the Queen his determination not to meet the Princess either in public or in private, her Majesty informed her that it was not possible she could be received at her drawing-room, in consequence of which the Princess wrote to her husband and to his mother,

* See Swift's entertaining letters to the grandfather of this individual, the Reverend John Blachford, vol. xvii. and xviii., Sir Walter Scott's edition.

and communicated the letters to the Speaker, with a request that they should be read to the House of Commons. To avoid further exposure, and the discreditable publicity of family quarrels, the House agreed to increase the income allowed her by the Prince (namely, 17,000*l.*); and on the motion of Lord Castlereagh, they unanimously voted her a sum of 50,000*l.* a year. This proposition Mr. Grattan supported, declaring, "that as she was not admitted to share in the establishment of her husband, Parliament should give her one of her own; and this was the best way of proceeding for the interest of the wife, the feelings of the husband, and the dignity of the House."*

The other question which Mr. Grattan supported, in 1814, was the Irish Spirit Intercourse Bill. The sixth article of the Irish Union had been directly infringed; by it the Irish were enabled to import their spirits into England; but being superior in strength to the English, the importation was suspended by Acts of Parliament passed in 1809 and 1811. Mr. Grattan had been absent when the subject had been brought forward, and regretted that he had not spoken on the question before. He said that "Irish questions were brought on so late in the session that he could not attend; besides," added he, "I could do no good. Ireland since the Union has not kept up her proportion; her increase after '82 was much greater than after 1800. The direction of Irish commerce has been quite changed by the Union; her exports twelve years preceding the Union were only one million less than in the twelve years subsequent—the incon-

* The Princess declined to accept more than 35,000*l.*, not wishing to add to the burdens of the people.

siderable benefit derived from commerce is greatly overbalanced by the drain to pay her debt—our manufactures have declined, and our exports have changed; they are chiefly raw materials and cattle, which are bad and injurious exports—our contribution has increased, and we have a right to the benefits that will enable us to pay it, namely, Corn Laws and Spirit Intercourse; instead of which, Parliament refuses these measures, and takes away the means of paying that contribution, although one of these measures is expressly guaranteed by the Union. Justice is not done to Ireland." Such were his opinions. Meantime the Scotch and Liverpool distillers petitioned Parliament to suspend the intercourse. Mr. Huskisson proposed to tax Irish spirits not as regarded quantity but strength, otherwise the Irish would have an advantage over the English distiller.

Sir John Newport insisted that the Act of Union had been violated, and that Ireland, since 1806, had been deprived of a benefit that was intended by Mr. Pitt to be granted to her at the Union. In this statement he was confirmed by the testimony of Lord Castlereagh. A bill was brought in to regulate the trade, which Mr. Grattan supported. He observed—

That Parliament had no right to alter that Act; it was similar to a covenant between two parties, one of whom was dead, and, on every principle of justice and honour, the living party ought to adhere scrupulously to that engagement, which the other was not in existence to defeat. If they selected any particular article (for instance, the spirit intercourse) for revision, they would establish a precedent which they might hereafter deplore; for, though the Parliament of Ireland did not exist, *the people of Ireland were in being*, and thousands of petitioners might come to the bar of the House, demanding a revision of other articles which appeared to affect their interest. The

Act of Union constituted the marriage articles between the two countries, and none of its provisions could be broken without annulling the contract.

The bill passed, and the injury done to Ireland was in some degree, but not effectually, remedied.

Sir Henry Parnell, in the session of 1814, had proposed a scale of duties for the regulation of the corn trade. Wheat, if under 84*s.* a quarter, was to pay a duty of 24*s.* on importation; if at 84*s.* only 2*s.* 6*d.* Oats, if 28*s.*, duty should be 24*s.* a quarter. Mr. Huskisson proposed a graduated scale. If wheat was at 63*s.*, the duty on importation should be 24*s.*; if oats were 22*s.*, duty should be 12*s.*; and as the grain advanced a shilling in price, the duty to decrease in the same proportion. Mr. Foster did not act in this case with his usual sagacity, and did injury by proposing that the protecting duty should cease when wheat was 100*s.* a quarter, and oats 33*s.* This resolution had no chance of succeeding, and Mr. Grattan told Foster he would be defeated. Foster replied—"*you are not for strong measures now,*" and persisted in his motion. Government rallied against Foster, and succeeded; they defeated him, but they lost the bill which had been brought in founded on Mr. Huskisson's resolutions. Great opposition arose in the manufacturing districts, and numerous petitions were presented against it; those from Ireland were in its favour; but on the motion of General Gascoigne, who represented a manufacturing and trading town, it was lost on a division of 106 to 116.

In the session of 1815, Mr. Robinson, Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed several resolutions on the subject, one of which permitted the importation of foreign corn, &c., for home consumption without payment of duty, when the

price of wheat was at or above 80*s*., and oats 26*s*. a quarter; but when British corn was below those prices, no foreign corn should be imported. These resolutions produced much ferment in the country, being strenuously opposed in the manufacturing districts; the debates in the House were long and animated—the agriculturist favouring and the manufacturing opposing all protection. The case of Ireland was in this respect different from that of England, the Union having proved so injurious to its manufactures, and having left the people no manufacture but that of land.

Mr. Grattan on this principle supported the resolution; his statements are worthy of notice, as they contain important and authentic references to the trade and commerce of Ireland:—

In the year 1812, Ireland exported 2,900,000*l*. worth of corn, of which 2,100,000*l*. came to Great Britain; in 1814, Ireland exported near 3,000,000*l*., most of which came to Great Britain. In the last half year, ending January, she exported into Great Britain 300,000 quarters of corn, while the foreigner exported 800,000, so that Ireland is driven out of the market, and foreign nations have taken her place. The question then is, shall we protect the farmer, or go out of tillage? I come to another position; whether we can supply corn enough for our own consumption? You have done it; you did so in the last century; you did so till the Act of 1765. England alone did it; we have done it lately; the two islands have supplied their own consumption, with all their increased manufactures, and all their increased population. In 1812 these islands imported 12,000,000*l*. worth of corn, and exported 14,000,000*l*., above 300,000*l*. more than their own consumption. The opposers of the measure combat this fact by an average—their average is fallacious; the cause of that self-supply was Ireland, and her new condition since the Act of 1807; but Ireland is a growing country, and her resources are a growing quantity; instead, therefore, of forming a calculation on an average, you should count on an increase. The evidence before the committee tells you, that Ireland must increase in tillage one-third, and it stands uncontroverted. Now I will tell

you how she has grown, and read you the accounts I have taken for the last fourteen years. I have divided them into two periods, seven years each. In the first seven years, commencing with 1801, Ireland exported to Great Britain 4,300,000 quarters of corn, and her growth, or increase in the course of that time, was 2,300,000 quarters. In the same period of fourteen years, foreign nations sent to Great Britain, in the first seven years, 6,000,400 quarters of corn; and in the last seven years, 4,200,000 quarters, and there was a decrease of 2,200,000 quarters. Thus Ireland has doubled her quantity; and foreign nations, in the same period, have declined one-third; and Ireland was coming into their place, as they are now coming into the place of Ireland.

On the progress of Irish husbandry, I beg leave to say a few sentences. Lord Pery was the father of Irish agriculture. In the depth and extent of his sagacious and prophetic intellect, he conceived for his country a project, which was nothing less than the creation of tillage. His plan was to bring the market of the capital to the door of every farmer in the remotest part of the island, and he did so by granting an inland bounty on the carriage of corn to Dublin. He found Ireland, in the article of corn, a country of import; he put in practice his plan—she ceased to import. She began to export; she began to export much; she proceeded to export more—she became a country of great, of growing, and of permanent export. The public care of Mr. Foster, and his vigorous mind, followed Lord Pery, and by a graduated scale of export, furthered the growth of tillage. Then came my right honourable friend (Sir John Newport), whose presence represses the ardour I feel to dwell on the imperishable honours annexed to his name and his measures. He finished the work by his bill of unlimited export; and Ireland, who was fed by imported corn in the middle of the last century, has, in the last war, fed herself on a scale of doubled population —supplied Great Britain with above two millions worth of corn; and sent near another million to supply your expeditions, and to feed foreign nations. It is an infirmity in the argument of the gentlemen of the other side of the question, that Ireland should have made no part of their calculation, and that, in contemplating the resources of the British empire, they should have overlooked one-third of the King's dominions. * * * * *

I hope you will think that the gentlemen have not made a case strong enough to incline you to reduce your people to a state in which they must depend on foreign nations for their food. * * * * *

I beg to return to that part of the subject which is comprehended in the denomination of Ireland. You know it was the policy of your ancestors to destroy the manufactures of Ireland; and it was the tendency of the Union to direct her capital to gross produce. Have you, thus, driven Ireland out of manufacture, and do you now propose to drive her out of tillage? You recollect that for ages Ireland has excluded the manufactures of other countries, and has given an exclusive preference to yours. Ireland desires, and desires of right, that, as she prefers your manufactures, you may prefer her corn. Do you propose that Ireland should prefer the British manufacturer, and that the British manufacturer should prefer the French husbandman? You know that Ireland owes 137,000,000*l.*, the principal debt of the war; that the interest is 6,500,000*l.*; that her revenue is not 5,500,000*l.*; and that her deficit to pay the interest is above a million a year. Do you mean that she should supply that deficit by giving up her agriculture? You know that of her interest, 4,500,000*l.* is paid to you. How? By her produce. When you propose that she should desert or diminish her husbandry, you shake your funded security. Again, you are aware that in rent to absentees, Ireland pays not less than two millions annually, and pays it out of her produce. When you propose to diminish—when you do not propose to augment that produce, you shake your landed security. Again, in the respective traffic of the two countries, the account stands so:—Ireland pays to Great Britain for commodities, at the current price, a large sum, about 4,500,000*l.*, for interest; for the rents of absentees 2,000,000*l.*—altogether about 16,000,000*l.* annually. The exportation of Ireland is about 17,000,000*l.*, of which 2,900,000*l.* is the export of corn. When you propose to diminish her produce in corn, nay, when you do not propose to increase it, you propose that she should not pay you that balance. Again, are you unapprized that the population of Ireland is not less than 6,000,000, and that a great proportion of that number are connected with tillage; if you go out of tillage, what will you do with that population? Will you, with the opposers of this

measure, consign that people to famine and to tumult, or, with the supporters of the measure, hand them over to plenty and to peace?

Again, in addition to these reflections, will you consider that the question before you is not merely a means of subsistence, but a measure of empire. England clothes Ireland—Ireland feeds England; and both live with one another, and by one another; the two nations are bound together by law, but there is something stronger than law; they are grappled together by the iron fangs of necessity, and not only legally united, but physically identified; and this is the very soul of your connexion. In the relationship of these two countries, mutual want is public concord—that intercourse which makes them physically dependent on one another, makes them physically independent of their enemies, and thus forms the strength of your empire as well as its abundance.

Sir, I am for this resolution. I am for it, because it is decisive, not ambiguous—because 80*s.* is a preference which the farmer will understand. Do not send him to your averages; for while you perplex the farmer with your calculations, the plough is at a stand. Sir, I am for the measure, because it gives strength to your funds—credit to your landed interest—identification to the people of the respective countries, and physical independence on the foreigner. I am for it, because it is an increase of your ways and means; because it promises plenty, where alone it can be relied on, namely, in your home market; and, with that plenty—cheapness; but that cheapness which is steady, and pays your farmer while it feeds your manufacturer, instead of that extravagant fluctuation which alternately ruins both; and I am for this measure, because it secures us against the policy suggested by its opponents, and reducible to three propositions—an abandonment of tillage; a relinquishment of your power to supply your own consumption; and a dependence on foreign markets for bread.

Such were Mr. Grattan's opinions on this question, which has so puzzled statesmen and political economists. They were founded on Irish considerations, as her interests were paramount in his mind. Great opposition was made to the

measure—the cry of *cheap bread and big loaf* was prevalent and predominant among the populace of London—tumults and outrages were the result. The houses of the Ministers, and the chief supporters of the Bill, were attacked and considerably damaged. Mr. Ponsonby's was assailed; but the populace were misinformed as to Mr. Grattan's residence—he escaped, and wrote as follows:—

MR. GRATTAN TO HENRY GRATTAN, JUN.

London, March 8, 1815.

MY DEAR HENRY,—Much rioting has taken place here, and some mischief. It is very shameful; the mob went to the houses of individuals and did great damage. I passed through them on foot, but looked so little like a gentleman, that they mistook me for one of themselves. 'T is over—the mob will do no more mischief, I think; though its hard to say. But the Bill will pass. Yours ever,

H. GRATTAN.

The Bill passed by 235 to 38.*

* A new doctrine has now arisen. Free Trade is in the ascendant, and those who formerly were for protection are against all duties, without regard to character, conduct, or consistency. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Peel) takes the lead in this revolution.—*Note by Editor.*

CHAPTER XV.

Buonaparte's return from Elba.—Question of War.—Mr. Grattan supports it.—His speech, and remarks on Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke.—Lord Grey opposes it.—Remarks on the conduct of the Opposition; on Lord Castlereagh and the Tory Party.—Catholic Question brought on by Sir Henry Parnell.—Feeling on the subject.—Mr. Grattan speaks.—Distress in Ireland.—Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald's letter.—Sir J. Newport's motion as to Ireland.—Effects of the Union.—National Bankruptcy.—Consolidation of the Exchequers.—Sir John Newport's letter to Mr. Grattan.—Catholic Question.—Mr. Bellew.—Sir H. Parnell's letter.—Catholic Committee apply to Mr. Grattan to support their claims (1817).—Sir James Mackintosh's remarks on debate (note).—Death of Ponsonby and Curran.—Mr. Grattan's letter to Lady Charleville.—Window Tax.—Discontent of Citizens of Dublin.—Mr. Grattan elected for Dublin, fifth time.—Attacked when chaired.—His reply to addresses then.—Proposes Catholic Question, 1819.—Letter to Judge Day.—Lord Holland's letter.—Diary of his illness and death.

THE return of Napoleon aroused Mr. Grattan from his retreat at Tinnehinch. He hated tyranny, especially a military tyranny. He had witnessed its effects in his own country, and all his apprehensions for her safety now returned. The obstinacy of the British Government as regarded the Catholics filled his mind with renewed uneasiness; and he beheld, in the restoration of Buonaparte, danger to Ireland, and insecurity to Great Britain.

On the 25th of February, 1815, Napoleon left Elba,* with 1000 men, and landed at Cannes, and

* The author was abroad after the battle of Paris, in 1814, and had an opportunity of witnessing the state of parties and the sentiments of the people: they were by no means so favourable to Buonaparte as were reported in England. His brother was at Elba when Buonaparte left it, and was the first to communicate the intelligence of his departure to the British officer at Piombino, whose want of vigilance was most unpardonable.

on the 1st of March he passed through Grenoble to Lyons. The armies and the Marshals deserted to him; and on the 20th he arrived* at Paris, having traversed 240 leagues in twenty days. Louis the Eighteenth retired to Ghent, and Buonaparte, by the month of June, had formed an army of 550,000 men.

Meantime, the allied powers (Great Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia) proscribed him; they placed him "*without the pale of nations*," and concluded a treaty whereby they bound themselves to keep up a force of 150,000 each, and not to lay down their arms till Buonaparte was disabled from making further attempts on France. Buonaparte then made overtures for peace: they were rejected, and the treaties were laid before Parliament. Meantime a meeting of the opposition was held at Devonshire House to determine on the course to be adopted, and Mr. Grattan was requested to attend; but as he meant to support the war, he declined to go; and acted in a similar manner with regard to a meeting at Mr. Ponsonby's. It was painful to him to separate from the opposition party with whom he had hitherto acted; but he had an instinctive horror of arbitrary and military government, and such he considered the French to be. He had always viewed Buonaparte, in his civil capacity, in the light of a mischievous citizen; and in his character of a great captain, as guilty of shocking atrocities; and with such a potentate, he thought negotiation hopeless, and peace no longer secure; accordingly he took the most decided part against him. On the 25th of May the treaties were discussed in the House of Commons, and an address, approving of them, was

* The conspiracy was well known at Paris, and the Chief of the Police (St. André) told Louis, the day before he left the Capital, that he knew the conspirators, and would have them all arrested that night, and shot by that hour next day, if the king would give the order. Louis replied,—No, I do not believe it.

moved by Lord Castlereagh,—to which an amendment was proposed by Lord John Cavendish, stating that, uninformed as the House was as to the principles and the extent of the stipulations signed at the Congress of Vienna, they could not be justified in declaring their approbation of any engagement by which those stipulations were recognised, and that to commence a war against France for the avowed purpose of excluding an individual from the Government of that country, appeared to be unwise.

Mr. John Smith, an excellent and benevolent man, seconded this amendment, after which Mr. Grattan rose, and delivered a most able and effective speech. The withdrawal of the Catholic Petition from his care and superintendence had served him, and some remarks that had been made upon his age and declining powers, had animated him to greater exertion: the effort was equal to that in 1805, and for a person just entering seventy years of age, it was a surprising performance. He spoke very rapidly, and was very animated; his voice seemed to have gained strength, and his manner somewhat partook of enthusiasm. He was vociferously cheered by the House,—so much so, that he was obliged to stop in some parts, and it was said that more applause had been elicited by that speech than by any since Mr. Pitt's on the treaty of Amiens. It caught the temper of the House and the feelings of the people. Mr. Plunket took the same part as Mr. Grattan, and distinguished himself on the occasion. The minority was respectable, but in numbers they stood, 92 to 331.

It would occupy too much space to give extracts from Mr. Grattan's speech on this occasion. The passages referring to Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke are those that will best come in here.

* * * * * The nation did not rise to resist Buonaparte, or defend Louis, because the nation could not rise

upon the army; her mind, as well as her constitution, was conquered; in fact, there was no nation,—everything was army, and everything was conquest. France had passed through all the degrees of political probation,—revolution, counter revolution, wild democracy, intense despotism, outrageous anarchy, philosophy, vanity, and madness, and now she lay exhausted, for horse, foot, and dragoons to exercise her power to appoint her a master, captain, or cornet who should put the brand of his name upon her government, calling it his dynasty, — and under this stamp of dishonour pass her on to futurity.

* * * * The authority of Mr. Fox has been alluded to—a great authority, and a great man: his name excites tenderness and wonder. To do justice to that immortal person you must not limit your view to this country: his genius was not confined to England: it acted three hundred miles off in breaking the chains of Ireland; it was seen three thousand miles off in communicating freedom to the Americans; it was visible, I know not how far off, in ameliorating the condition of the Indian; it was discernible on the coast of Africa, in accomplishing the abolition of the slave trade. You are to measure the magnitude of his mind by parallels of latitude. His heart was soft as that of a woman,—his intellect was adamant—his weakness were virtues; they protected him against the hard habit of a politician, and assisted nature to make him amiable and interesting. The question discussed by Mr. Fox in 1792 was, whether you would treat with a revolutionary government?—the present is, whether you will confirm a military and hostile one. You will observe that when Mr. Fox was willing to treat, the French, it was understood, were ready to evacuate the Low Countries. If you confirm the present government, you must expect to lose them. Mr. Fox objected to the idea of driving France upon her resources, lest you should make her a military government. The question now is, whether you will make that military government perpetual. I, therefore, do not think the theory of Mr. Fox can be quoted against us; and the practice of Mr. Fox tends to establish our proposition, for he treated with Buonaparte, and failed. Mr. Fox was tenacious of England, and would never yield an iota of her superiority; but the failure of the attempt to treat was to be found, not in Mr. Fox, but in Buonaparte.

On the French subject, speaking of authority, we cannot forget Mr. Burke,—Mr. Burke, the prodigy of nature and acquisition. He read everything,—he saw everything—he foresaw everything. His knowledge of history amounted to a power of foretelling; and when he perceived the wild work that was doing in France, that great political physician, intelligent of symptoms, distinguished between the access of fever and the force of health; and what other men conceived to be the vigor of her constitution, he knew to be

no more than the paroxysm of her madness, and then, prophet-like, he pronounced the destinies of France, and in his prophetic fury admonished nations.

Lord Grey on this question separated from his friend Lord Grenville, and proposed in the Lords an amendment similar to that moved in the Commons. He was mistaken and misinformed, and was misled by persons who gave him erroneous intelligence, who possessed little judgment,* and who were not remarkable for the soundness of their understanding, or their steadiness of principle; the fact was, that France had grown tired of war: the officers had got money, and wished to enjoy it, and republicans and legitimatists equally disliked Buonaparte. He said that France, single-handed, would beat the allies; and he had scarcely spoken when in a few days the news came that England, single-handed, had beaten France.† He thought Europe would be at the feet of France, and he found France at the feet of England. He was obstinate and cold,—Mr. Whitbread hot, and inconsiderate. Mr. Ponsonby, less injudicious in his opposition, thought that he was bound in honour to the party that had chosen him leader. The question was an unfortunate one for the Whigs, and considerably injured their popularity, for no minister can ever be very popular in England who is not anti-Gallican. They set out on a wrong principle: they began by admitting the title of Buonaparte, whereas he had no title; but they praised him because he annoyed the Government, and they disliked the Bourbon because he was set

* Among the persons who were said to have communicated with Lord Grey were Sir Robert Wilson and Mr. Bruce—they, with Mr. Hutchinson (now Lord Donoughmore), aided in the escape of Lavelette. These individuals bitterly complained of the laws of France, which only punished their offence by imprisonment, quite forgetting that if they had been guilty of such an offence in their own country, they would have paid the penalty with their lives. The information given to Lord Grey was quite incorrect and completely misled him.

† The battle of Waterloo.

up by the Prince. They appeared to be not only victims of party, but partisans of Napoleon, and apologists of the enemy of their country—displaying the fear of vulgar minds to admire the man who beats down everything. They showed great want of foresight, and great imprudence, and fell into the error of Fox's principle, without having ability to prevent its bad consequence.

England did not seek to interfere with the Government of another country, but with a man who had interfered with it already, and whose object was not to give a government to France, but to give a military government to Europe. His Constitution was a farce; his ideas were those of a soldier, and his object was to militarise mankind.

In concluding this important subject, it must be observed that the British minister had committed a great mistake. In 1814, he had fallen into the same error that in former times the Tories had been guilty of; they gave up the glory and empire of England at the treaty of Utrecht, and afterwards wanted to give over the country to the Pretender. They first sacrificed the victories of Great Britain, and then wanted to sacrifice the empire: those men were traitors. The Minister of 1814 committed a similar blunder, though not intentionally. Trained up in Ireland, and spoiled by the profligacy of the Union, his mind was quite unequal to the greatness of his situation. The business of negotiation, and the Congress of Vienna was far above his capacity: he did not obtain what he might, either politically, commercially, or militarily. He did not take the grand and comprehensive view that Lord Chatham would. The guarantee he agreed to in 1814 was insufficient and delusive, as he took moral instead of physical security. He suffered Napoleon to escape from Elba, and the old troops to be sent to America; the treaty was violated—the ex-Emperor returned,—and England

had to fight the battle over again. Thus, he risked the empire, and put to hazard all her past successes. He would have lost Waterloo, but for Wellington; and if he had failed there, as he had at Walcheren, he ought to have paid the forfeit with his head; but to exact such a penalty, England required more virtue, and the Parliament more integrity. Castlereagh knew this, and proved himself safe: however, the battle was gained—the business was done,—and the Minister got the credit: he then grew elate, because quite *cock-a-whoop*,* and vainglorious, and attacked the Whigs in a bitter and scornful manner, and in this he showed his folly and want of statesmanship. In a young man, this would have been pardonable, but in an aged statesman it was culpable. He exposed himself to an answer which he did not get, and which the Whig party could and should have given: thus his imprudence escaped observation, but it was a severe reflection upon his understanding as a minister; for no greater proof of sense or superiority can be given than when a victory is gained, not to convert that victory into a triumph.

Soon after the debate on the war, the Catholic question was brought forward under the auspices of Sir Henry Parnell. He had very injudiciously accepted the petition which had been withdrawn from Mr. Grattan; but the great success which the latter had met with on the question of war or peace had raised his hopes and spirits, and gained for him additional weight among the British people, which he still trusted would be turned to the advantage of his country, and preserve her from the dangers that discord might occasion.

On the 18th of May, 1815, Sir Henry Parnell submitted some resolutions to the House, which he

* See his Speech on the Foreign Treaties, Parl. Deb., vol. xxxii. p. 687, *t ante.*

intended should form the groundwork of the Relief Bill; they had emanated from the members of the late Catholic Board, and had been already published in the newspapers. He read them to the House, and moved to bring them up. This, on the point of order, was objected to; he then moved the first; this, too, was objected to, on the ground that it went to effect a change in matters where religion was concerned, and for that a committee of the whole House was necessary. Being thus pressed, he thought proper to yield, and after an awkward and unparliamentary exhibition, he at length withdrew them. On the 30th of May, he brought forward the Government petition, and moved for a committee. Several members condemned his conduct, and that of the Catholic body. Mr. Richard Wellesley, Mr. Douglas, Lord Binning, and others expressed themselves highly dissatisfied, and declared they would stay away from the debate. Sir John Newport and some of his friends stated they would also adopt that course, and informed Mr. Grattan, but he dissuaded them from it, and when the debate came on he rose to support the motion. On his rising he was received with great applause, and was loudly cheered. He thus expressed himself:—

Sir, I condemn the application for unqualified concession; for the Catholics put their demand in a shape that will ensure its rejection. If I had flattered them, and told them you have a right to make this demand, urge it, and you will succeed, I should have deceived them. I have supported the question *with a desperate fidelity*. I do not mean by desperate that my zeal would lead me to any constitutional or unworthy compromise, but it has always sustained me, even when there was no hope of success. Unless they come to this House in a spirit of conciliation, they will not succeed. I will go farther and say, that conciliation is not only essential to their interest, but essential to their duty; if they do not succeed, it will not be owing to any illiberality in the Protestant, but to a want of moderation among themselves. If they do not succeed, their want of success will arise from a want of dis-

cretion. I regard the Catholic body with sentiments of strong attachment: the warmth of young minds may have betrayed some of them into error, which I regret is injurious to their cause; but unless conciliation is adopted, nothing else can be of use. I shall vote for the committee; the sentiments I shall carry into it are those that are registered on the rolls of Parliament.

The House cheered Mr. Grattan repeatedly on his resuming his seat.

Mr. Ponsonby condemned the conduct that had been pursued towards Mr. Grattan, but felt persuaded it had made no impression on his mind; to him they owed more than to any man alive; yet how did they pay their debt of gratitude? But this would not place either him or his right honourable friend on the list of their opponents. He accordingly supported the motion. The numbers were —for the committee 147, against it 228.

At this period (1816), distress was rapidly increasing throughout Ireland, and the people began to feel it more severely, and to complain of it more loudly than ever. The general decline of manufactures was aggravated by the absence of the nobility and gentry from the metropolis, and the citizens of Dublin became almost unable to pay even the ordinary taxes. Mr. Grattan, in consequence, made private representations to the Chancellor of the Irish Exchequer on their behalf; but the reply he received held out little hope of relief—the case was beyond his power—the evil consequences of the Union were widely spreading, and national bankruptcy fast approaching.

MR. VESEY FITZGERALD TO MR. GRATTAN.

House of Commons, Friday, 1816.

MY DEAR SIR,—I hasten to reply to your letter, and I beg to assure you, that I shall have pleasure, as far as either of the subjects* to which you refer may rest with me, in either deferring or taking them up, as may suit your convenience.

* The taxes affecting the citizens of Dublin.

I perceive that on the motion,* of which our friend Sir John Newport has given notice, you will wish to be present; at the same time, if you should not, and that you wish it, I could postpone the consideration of the relief which might be extended to the inhabitants of Dublin until your arrival.

I intend to propose to Parliament not to relieve the tax upon them, which they at present pay towards the police establishment, but to make a certain allowance for it in that which they pay in the shape of assessed taxes.

You will see that if the subject should be brought forward by any other person, or *written up* in the Irish papers, I can hardly defer the consideration of it, as it would be expedient, doubtless, to set the matter at rest; and to show to the petitioners that we are willing to do everything we can for them. I certainly expect I am so far obliged to do it, shall not anticipate your arrival.

If it is acceptable to you, as I am sure from your disposition it will be, to communicate to those who have addressed you, that it is our wish to consider their application in the most favourable manner which we can, consistently, with the present state of our financial distress.

This I am sure you will like to have communicated.

As to the Grocers' Petition, I do not, I confess, wish to stir the subject, but shall be happy to consult with you upon it, on your arrival here.

I beg your pardon for the haste in which I write, in the House of Commons, with noise around me. Believe me, my dear Sir, with great respect, always your most faithful and obliged servant,

WM. VESEY FITZGERALD.

The state of Ireland, which was thus deteriorating, called forth Sir John Newport's exertions, and on the 26th April, he proposed an address to the Prince Regent, for documents to show the extent and nature of the evils of Ireland, and the necessity which required the application of so large a military force as 25,000 men in the time of peace, and for information so as to enable Parliament to examine into the causes of those evils, and adopt such remedies as would extirpate them. In this debate the state of Ireland was fully depicted, the victim of poverty and distress, of civil and religious discord—the Catholics excluded from the Constitution, and the Orange party supported by the Go-

* An address to the Prince Regent on the state of Ireland, 26th of April.

vernment. On this point Mr. Plunket expressed himself most ably:—

If an improvement does not take place in the affairs of Ireland, 40,000 men will not be sufficient to perform the duties that now required 25,000. If it was intended to maintain that force permanently in Ireland—if the Insurrection Act was to be continued—if the people were to be subject to domiciliary visits at night—liable to be imprisoned and transported, not by the verdict of a jury, but by summary commitments, and if all these miseries were to be enforced by the aid of the bayonet—I say that the House would not only neglect, but grossly abandon its duty, if it refused to enquire why such things were necessary.

On this occasion Mr. Grattan spoke as follows:—

The evils of Ireland are classed under four heads—religious animosity, financial embarrassment, pecuniary distress, and the prevalence of a banditti in various parts of Ireland. The remedy of the first is the repeal of the penal laws; the second arises from the excess of expenditure over revenue—which excess Ireland could not pay. Her debt is 150,000,000*l.*, her interest above 6,000,000*l.*, her revenue above 5,000,000*l.*—the remedy is to assist her. The third, the pecuniary distress, arises from the circumstances of the times, and the change from war to peace, which affects the price of markets—that evil is temporary. As to the fourth—public disturbances—it is not easy to ascertain from what cause they spring; but if the three others are settled, the latter could not be very difficult; it is a disorder on the surface which is not taken into the circulation of the blood; the difficulties of each country are great, but recollect, if your difficulties are great, your consolation is not inconsiderable—you have recovered the British empire—you have procured the deliverance of Europe—you have decided the rivalship between France and Great Britain; and you have made a treaty of peace which gives for all these things physical security. For that treaty I should most cheerfully have given my humble vote, with this conviction, that these islands—Great Britain and Ireland—had risen to the head of Europe, and that the change which had taken place in the foreign relationship of these countries was a matter not merely of wonder but thanksgiving.

This motion was managed with some adroitness by the Secretary* (Mr. Peel), who by way of amendment merely asked for documents to show

* Secretary in Ireland from 1813 to 1819.

the nature and extent of the disturbances, and the measures adopted in consequence; and this he carried by 187 to 105. Notwithstanding those ministerial evasions, and those wretched manœuvres, public calamity could no longer be concealed or suppressed; it advanced with rapid strides, and the effects of the Union that were developing themselves more and more every day, at length became fearfully visible. Ireland was found unable to bear the weight of taxation; the increase of the absentee drain, and the decay of her manufactures,—these produced a general bankruptcy, and she broke down under the weight of her multiplied calamities. The system of finance proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, had totally failed. He had found it impossible to collect the ordinary assessed taxes; and even in the north of Ireland—the wealthiest part of the kingdom—notices were served on the collectors that carriages, horses, servants, cars, &c. &c., would be given up, and in one year three thousand notices of this nature were sent in; and these embraced not merely articles of luxury but of comfort. This stoical determination, and the spirit of opposition to additional burdens, it was feared might be extended farther, and the Government found it necessary to revert to the Act of Union, which had been the means of causing so much of this calamity. They accordingly proposed a new arrangement, and, on the 20th May, the Chancellor of the Exchequer submitted the three following resolutions to the House of Commons:—

1st. That the value of the respective debts of Great Britain and Ireland have been in the same proportion to each other, with the respective contributions of each country, and that the respective circumstances of the two countries will admit of their contributing indiscriminately by equal taxes imposed upon the same articles; and that it is no longer necessary to regulate the con-

tributions according to the value prescribed by the Acts of Union.

2ndly. That all future expenses, with the interest and charges of all debts hitherto contracted, shall be defrayed indiscriminately by equal taxes on the same articles in each country; and that from time to time, as circumstances may require, that such taxes may be imposed.

3rdly. That the annual revenue of Great Britain and Ireland be consolidated into one fund, to be applied to the general revenue of the kingdom.

Such were the resolutions, and it must excite some surprise that any body of legislators could have so far deceived themselves and the country by the adoption of resolutions which they knew were neither true nor applicable—to talk of *equalising taxation* between Ireland and England, was a perfect mockery, and it seemed to have been so considered—only five Irish and one English member spoke on a subject where millions of money and the interests of millions of persons were concerned, and the measure passed through the Legislature as would a turnpike bill, or a parish poor rate.—Mr. Grattan was fortunately absent, and was saved the humiliation of witnessing this exposure of his country, though it would have fully borne out his predictions as to the boasted Union that was to have given Ireland such wealth and such prosperity. Truth demands that notice should be taken of some of the statements made on the occasion. Mr. Ponsonby said that Ireland could not pay her taxes, she could not even pay the interest of her debt, she was bankrupt, or, if the term was less harsh, she was insolvent—he did not think that Ireland derived advantage from contracting loans in England, he did not blame the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but he thought the measure now came too late. Mr. Leslie Foster* said Ireland had made great efforts since the Union, her contributions to the general expenses of the empire these fifteen

* Afterwards appointed one of the Barons of the Court of Exchequer. He died in 1841.

years, amounted to 103,000,000*l.* and the whole amount of available revenue in that period was 12,735,000*l.*, the Union imposed on Ireland an expenditure eight times greater than her revenue—in nine years the Irish taxes had doubled — in 1800, 2,440,000*l.*; in 1810, 4,280,000*l.*; in 1816, 5,752,000*l.*; in fact taxation had arrived at its *ne plus ultra*. Sir John Newport said, if Ireland had not met her expenditure, it was not because she had not made exertions to increase the revenue, but because the Union had imposed a burden which it was impossible for her to bear—he added, Though not a member of the Imperial Parliament, *I gave my support to that measure influenced by expectations that have proved illusive, and by promises which have not been fulfilled.**

Mr. Grattan's Constituents were daily growing more impatient under the load of taxation, and the duty upon windows they complained of in particular —it was originally imposed as a war tax, and, on peace being concluded, the citizens of Dublin expected it would have been taken off. Mr. Grattan wrote on the subject to Sir John Newport, who does not appear to have coincided with him in attributing praise to the minister for his plan of consolidating the exchequers, and who seems to have considered his plan of finance superior to that of his successors.

SIR JOHN NEWPORT TO MR. GRATTAN.

New Park, 25th October, 1817.

MY DEAR GRATTAN,—I received your very few unexpected lines, and profess myself quite at a loss to answer your queries, and the

* A very important and constitutional measure for Ireland was carried this session. Mr. Horner introduced an Irish Grand Jury Bill, by which the old practice of receiving sworn depositions by Grand Juries was done away with, and the *vivâ voce* examination of witnesses was substituted. The Secretary, Mr. Peel, after consulting the English Crown lawyers, found that the practice in Ireland could not be defended, and was clearly against law. Some difficulty was encountered in consequence of the opposition from a few of the Irish Judges, but this was ultimately got over, and the measure passed. It reflected great credit on Mr. Horner.

more as I much fear I do not understand rightly their import, my answer would not accord with what I conjecture to be your opinion on this subject of taxation. I do not think quite so highly as you do of the liberality of Great Britain in the consolidation of the Exchequer, and in ceasing to call for the execution of *an agreement into which we had been deluded;** and our making good a proportion of charge which we were quite incompetent to supply; we did attempt it many years and beggared Ireland in the effort—the necessary result was that which followed; for, as my excellent and regretted friend Ponsonby said, if Ireland could not pay, and England would not pay, the creditor on joint security must have been unpaid. Besides, I am well convinced that sound policy concurs with justice in urging on Parliament a considerable reduction of the taxation of Ireland, which has risen so high and produced such ruinous effects on the resident inhabitants of the middle and higher ranks, as have deprived them of that fair influence in society that goes to maintaining British connection; it has also produced such a sense of their humbled and degraded state, a daily increasing dislike to the causes from whence it has originated, and a disposition to attribute the whole to the overweening and wild ambition of British councils. I see, and hear, and feelingly lament, the progress of this spirit which accompanies every visit of the tax-gatherer. Be assured those who consider the present parochial resolutions as merely an ebullition of violence in Dublin, judge very falsely; that Vansittart and Hawthorne have called forth these declarations most foolishly as well as illegally is my opinion, and I have, I believe, given great offence by avowing that opinion; yet I must adhere to it, as well as to my conviction that the valuation sought to be *thus* procured was intended as a first essay towards a property tax in Ireland, which would consummate our ruin, by the divisions and the disclosures that would accompany its establishment, even more than the burthen it would impose.

I have wearied you I am sure with a long answer to two or three queries, or half queries, and yet it can scarcely be called an answer. Much of what is said in your Dublin resolutions† is very flowery, very exaggerated, and consequently very foolish; but they are hard pressed and feel sore at the pressure, and when men are in that state they often talk incoherently and injudiciously—of the correspondent and its critique on my official career I think little—it admits an easy and short reply; I raised the supplies of two years, not by *burthensome* and *unnecessary* taxation, but in the proportion of one-third and more of the entire by regulation of old taxes, and reform of abuses; my two budgets in produce exceeded *their estimates* as the million does 650,000—I left in the receipt of

* The Union. † On the subject of Taxation.

the treasury a surplus beyond the charge of debt of one million; and lastly, the tax on houses not paying window or hearth tax was proportionate to the *rent reserved by lease, not at any valuation* whatever. As to the division of the Boards, Foster's commission of Parliament reported its necessity, all my successors have sanctioned it.

I have enjoyed this whole year uncommon health.—Lady N. is pretty well, and unites with me her regard to Mrs. Grattan and yourself.—Always truly yours,

JOHN NEWPORT.

The Catholic question was brought forward in 1816, under better auspices than in the preceding year. Several of the leading Catholics among the aristocracy of that body, among whom were Lords Southwell and Lord Trimleston, prepared a petition to Parliament, and entrusted it to Mr. Grattan: it was general in its demand, and conciliatory in its tone. On the 21st May he presented it, and moved a resolution similar to that in a former year, "that the House would, in the next session, take the state of the Penal Laws into their consideration." He did not go into the merits of the case; and, as the motion was seconded by Sir Henry Parnell, there was no appearance of division among the Catholic body. Lord Castlereagh stated that it was necessary that the question should be set at rest—till it was settled the Government could not act with impartiality; the motion, however, was rejected by 172 to 141. On the 6th June, Sir Henry Parnell, who had previously presented petitions from the great body of Catholics, praying for unrestricted emancipation, moved a number of resolutions similar to those he had proposed in the last session, which had previously been published in the newspapers in the form of a bill of relief. Mr. Peel, the secretary for Ireland, objected on the ground that the standing orders of the House allowed no motion for a bill which affected the religion of the country to be introduced without a previous committee. Lord

Castlereagh remonstrated with Sir Henry Parnell on the course which he pursued, and which had caused many of the friends of the cause to withdraw themselves—his imprudent measures would injure them—under such auspices they could do no good, and it was desirable that he would abandon his motion. Ultimately Sir Henry Parnell was induced to withdraw the resolutions.

These injudicious proceedings were of much disservice in the country; but in the ensuing year (1817) another petition from the same body was entrusted to Mr. Grattan through Lord Southwell, the chairman, who accompanied it with a request that he would ground a motion thereon. The following letters relate to the proceeding and subject of domestic nomination on which Mr. Grattan agreed with the petitioners—he was desirous to close the question which had been left over too long, and which he conceived would ultimately lead to consequences injurious to the empire:—

MR. BELLEW TO MR. GRATTAN.

Dublin, 1st February, 1817.

DEAR SIR,—I had the honour of receiving your note of the 16th January, and suppose that you have seen in the public papers the advertisement for a meeting, on Tuesday next, of those who signed the petition which you presented to the House of Commons last session. The measure which is intended to be proposed is what I mentioned to you in my letter from Ballyderelan, and of which you expressed your approbation—viz. calling on you and Lord Donoughmore by letter from our chairman, requesting you would move, on the prayer of our petition of last year, on as early a day during the present session as you should judge fit; at *the desire of Mr. M'Donnell*, it is intended to propose a second resolution, stating, in substance, that whilst we adhere to the principles expressed in our petition of last year, we think it right that our chairman should state in the letter *to be written by him*, that if domestic nomination should be deemed satisfactory to the Legislature, it will derive value in our eyes, from appearing to be the measure of arrangement most agreeable to the bishops and others of our religious communion.

I should be glad of a line from you, if possible, by the return of

post, to say if you see any and what objection to the second resolution. A paragraph has appeared in the papers, authorized, though not signed, by those who have called the meeting, stating that it is intended to propose something with a view to show our desire that, as far as possible, the general wishes of the Catholic body should be attended to in any arrangements that may accompany a bill for their relief. A few of us are to meet at four o'clock on Monday, to arrange what we are to propose next day, and I should wish to know your sentiments before we meet.—I have the honour to be, sir, with great respect, your obedient servant,

WM. BELLEW.

SIR HENRY PARNELL TO MR. GRATTAN.

Emo Park, February 14, 1817.

MY DEAR SIR,—As it is necessary and proper I should do what I can for those Catholics who have given me their petition, so that I do no not prejudice the general debate, I have written to Mr. Brougham to give notice that I will move for a *select* committee to inquire into the Penal Laws on the 11th of March; I shall probably postpone it till after the assizes.

Lord Castlereagh told me last session he thought such an inquiry would be useful, provided the report went no farther than to set forth the several provisions of the laws now in force, and that little time was occupied in making it.

If I could get a committee before Easter, I should be ready with a report the first week after the recess. I should not wish to have the report go at all into the merits of the question, but to have it as a satisfactory groundwork of legislation. It would gratify the Catholics, and lead the public opinion of England to become more favourable to them. I think the House can seldom be got to embark heartily in a measure without a select committee; and from what I observe, if a committee can be got, the question at issue is sure to be carried.—Believe me, my dear sir, yours, very truly,

H. PARNELL.

The Catholic Committee, consisting of most of the old board, now thought fit to apply to Mr. Grattan (probably they were advised to do so by Sir Henry Parnell), and requested he would support their petition; but that, if the Legislature deemed it impossible to alter their condition without a veto, they would be much more satisfied to remain as they were;—that their petition had been intrusted to Sir Henry Parnell; and they requested Mr.

Grattan would give him the benefit of his advice and co-operation, and concert the means most likely to attain their object. In reply to this, Mr. Grattan stated, "he was glad to learn they continued to Sir Henry Parnell the custody of their petition; that he would be ready to communicate with him when he was pleased to do him that honour; but he would not concur in the idea that perpetual exclusion from the constitution was preferable to civil liberty with the veto."

On the 9th May (1817), Mr. Grattan renewed his efforts, and moved on the petition he had presented, for a committee to consider the state of the laws affecting them; he spoke short, and chiefly in reply, for which he reserved himself—it is an able and interesting speech. The reference to it by Sir James Mackintosh* is worthy of observation, as well as his remark on Mr. Peel. This individual took a most active part on the occasion, his speech formed a singular contrast with his subsequent conduct in 1829, and in a great degree influenced the division against the Catholics, which was 245 to 221.

In the month of July (1817), the country was unfortunately deprived of the services of Mr. Ponsonby —the habits of a Parliamentary life and the tedious sittings in the heated atmosphere of the House of Commons had affected his health, he had been accustomed to an active life, to the sports of the field, and to much exercise both on foot and on horseback, he felt the change when he commenced a London campaign, and a continued attendance in

* 10th May, 1817.—Came home at three this morning from our defeat on the Catholic question. Poor Grattan's last exhibition of his setting genius, and of that gentle goodness which will glow till the last spark of life be extinguished. Peel made a speech of little merit, but elegantly and clearly expressed, and so well delivered as to be applauded to excess. He is a great proof of the great value of the mechanical parts of speaking, when combined with industry and education. He now fills the important place of spokesman to the intolerant faction. * * *—*From Sir James Mackintosh's Memoirs.*

the House, and on Committees from January to July;* he was attacked by apoplexy, and shortly after expired; his character has been already described, and his conduct was justly praised by Mr. Lamb (Lord Melbourne), on moving the writ for the place he represented (the county of Wicklow). As a leader to the opposition party his death was a severe loss, to Mr. Grattan it was a matter of sincere regret, and to Ireland a serious calamity, for under all changes and circumstances, George Ponsonby (unlike many others) steadily and unostentatiously preserved his natural affection for his native land. Independent of the private friendship that subsisted between them and the esteem that Mr. Grattan entertained for him, he was one of the last of that old Irish party that had acted together when Ireland was a nation, and side by side with whom Mr. Grattan almost from his outset in public life had fought the hard battles of his country in defence of her civil and religious liberty, and her existence as a nation in opposition to the arbitrary and tyrannical rulers who so long misgoverned and oppressed her.†

The Countess of Charleville, a mutual friend and a great admirer of Mr. Grattan, communicated to him in Ireland the melancholy intelligence of his death, to whom he replied as follows:—

MR. GRATTAN TO LADY CHARLEVILLE.

Dublin, 56, Stephen's Green, July 17, 1817.

MY DEAR MADAM, — The family of our departed friend had *reigned* in Ireland—their dynasty with now and then a job, was mild—the old speaker Ponsonby bore his faculty graciously—they defended the powers of the country with their own and lost both;

* One of the fair arguments against the Union is the excess of business in Parliament. No constitution can stand the labour. It has caused the death of several members even in the author's career. Such is the extended dominion of Great Britain that justice is imperfectly done, and redress, if administered, often comes too late.

† This year also brought another distinguished Irishman to the grave—John Philpot Curran—who expired on the 14th of October, at Brompton, near London, in the 68th year of his age. Mr. Ponsonby was in his 63rd

they stood by Parliament in Ireland to the last, and followed the Constitution to England, and expired as far as relates to the Irish branch in the person of George—in the maturity of his honours and in his vocation. He had abilities and discretion, was a sound leader of a party, and lived and died worthy of his race. I had a public and private connexion with him for thirty-five years. I found him a man of worth—it was an oak that will be missed from the forest.

With respect to his family, his death is calamitous, most injurious to his party, and fortunate for his fame.

Yours, most truly and affectionately,

H. GRATTAN.

As the ordinary term for the continuance of Parliament was soon to expire, Mr. Grattan did not think it advisable to urge the Catholic question in 1818, but waited till the succeeding year when the new Parliament was to assemble, and, after supporting the motion of his colleague Mr. Shaw, for the repeal of the window tax, left London. Before his departure he visited his friend Lord Holland, whose society he so highly esteemed. Sir James Mackintosh was one of the guests he met there, and as his remarks may not prove uninteresting they are here subjoined.†

* "30th April, 1818.—At Holland House, found Grattan, Plunket, Brougham, &c. Grattan was put on his best conversation. He gave very interesting and spirited sketches of the great men whom he had seen in his youth, particularly Lord Chatham; describing with delight 'his breathing thoughts and burning words,' which it was impossible for such a man as Grattan not to prefer to the eloquence of argument and business which has succeeded. He disliked the favourite notion that Pitt far surpassed his father. In truth, they were too unlike to be compared. Grattan charmed us till two o'clock.

"May 1st, Grattan again at breakfast. There is nobody so odd, so gentle, and so admirable, his sayings are not to be separated from his manner. Plunket never addresses Grattan without 'Sir,' with a respectful voice. This mark of respect, or almost reverence, is common amongst the Irish, and certainly most amply due to this amiable and venerable person."—*George Moore's Notes to Mackintosh.*

"We walked together as far as Lord Lansdowne's, in Berkeley Square, where he lived at the time, and discoursing on various topics after his manner, he came to the character of Mr. Grattan, which he said was marked with a peculiar benevolence not easily described, '*inspiring a tender respect.*' The character of Mr. Grattan I know, was a particular favourite of his. We talked, then, of the two Chief Justices in Ireland, Plunket and Bushe; and Mackintosh said, perhaps there have been as great lawyers, but two such accomplished men never before filled the situa-

The citizens of Dublin renewed their complaints of the Union, and of the injuries they suffered in consequence, and pressed most urgently to be relieved from the window tax; great distress had occurred in Ireland in 1817, owing to the wetness of the season and the badness of the harvest, scarcity prevailed in all parts, and fever, the necessary attendant, extended its ravages around;* application was made to Parliament, and Mr. Grattan was requested to support the unqualified repeal of the tax, but he declined to do so without providing some equivalent; at this the citizens were displeased, and intrusted their petition solely to the care of his colleague (Mr. Shaw). In the ensuing year (1818), a general election took place, and Mr. Grattan was returned for the city of Dublin without opposition, but after leaving the hustings, he was attacked by a mob that demolished the chair, and severely assailed him, he received a blow of a wooden stave in the face which caused a considerable effusion of blood, he however evinced great courage, and possessed strength to return the assault, and after flinging back the piece of wood at his assailant, fell bleeding in the arms of his son, and was carried into an adjoining house.† By the exertions of Lord Charlemont and other friends, the rioters were prevailed on to disperse. Both parties, Catholic and Protestant, accused each other, the one said it was done by the Orange faction in consequence of his conduct on the window tax. The other that it was done by the

tions together. He repeated what he had said some years before, that Lord Plunket, had he been regularly trained to the British House of Commons, would have been the greatest speaker there that he remembered."—*Mackintosh's Memoirs*, vol. ii.

* The author's brother-in-law (John Blachford) fell one of the first victims to this fearful malady.

† He was confined for a period of three weeks by the injury, and had a narrow escape of losing his eye. Notwithstanding his suffering, he never uttered a harsh expression; his only remark was, "*Like Actæon, I am devoured by my own hounds!*"

Catholics in consequence of his conduct on their petition. This accident, however, drew forth a general expression of regard from the people, and addresses were presented to him from all parties, and from all the parishes in Dublin. His answers are not devoid of interest; in one of them from the parish of St. Mark some allusion was made to the writings of Dean Swift, and to the measure of the Union. His reply was as follows:—

July, 1818.

My Friends and Fellow-Citizens,—There is in every community a set of men who hang loose on the society, and who form no part of it, although they may occasionally interrupt its repose,—they are to be forgiven and forgotten. No wise man, no candid man, can attribute to the community their actions, nor can their wild proceedings blemish the society, although for a moment they interrupt its repose. I enter into the spirit with which you applaud our great countryman, the illustrious Swift, and have an hereditary attachment to his genius and his patriotism. In defending your rights I did my duty, and shall always defend the privileges of Ireland. I remain gratefully, your faithful humble servant,

H. Grattan.

In 1819 the Catholic question was again brought before Parliament, and Mr. Grattan, untired and indefatigable in his efforts on behalf of his countrymen, made now his last appeal on their behalf. He still entertained serious apprehensions for the safety of the country—in conversing shortly before this period with his friends, Peter Burrowes and Mr. Berwick, he observed,—

"*I fear that some time or other this question will be fatal, it will make the Irish distrustful and never place any confidence in England; the people take no interest in the Imperial Parliament: it is too far, and its remedies too late.* If taxes increase, and jobs continue—and that trade does not flourish, I doubt that the Union will hold—it has sunk the country, and I do not see any good resulting from it—the best of our people have become absentees, and Dublin is ruined. Ireland held up her head formerly, but she is now a beggar at the door of Great Britain." Then striking his forehead, he exclaimed as in anguish—"*There is no thinking of it.* But these countries from their size must stand together,—united *quoad* nature,—distinct *quoad* legislation."

On the 3rd of April he requested the friends of the measure to meet at his residence in London, to consider the best course to adopt—Mr. Wilberforce, Plunket, Ponsonby, Tierney, Abercromby, Brougham, Sir James Mackintosh, and Sir John Newport, &c. &c., attended, and they all agreed on the expediency of bringing forward the question—it was fixed for the 3rd of May, and on that day Mr. Grattan presented to the House eight petitions from Roman Catholics, and five from Protestants, in favour of the measure. After a short but animated speech, and very complimentary to the individuals who had at various times supported the measure, he thus concluded:—

It is said an arrangement is impossible—to take away privilege it seems, then, is easy; but to restore—to retrace the *diabolical course*, there is the difficulty. Not the ability and sound judgment of Mr. Ponsonby were adequate (I will name the committee) —not the modest truth of Mr. Elliott's intellect—not the refining genius of Mr. Windham—not the strenuous capacity of Mr. Whitbread—nor the all-enlightened perfection of Sir Samuel Romilly's understanding. These men were of the committee to frame the bill, they are now great authorities to support it; authorities canonized by death; but I do not despair; my right honourable friend (Mr. Tierney) still lives; the trusty constitutional hand that drew the bill (Sir Arthur Pigott) still lives; the noble lord (Castlereagh), his enemies must allow him abilities, he lives; the luminary (Mr. Canning) by his side, he lives; and the good ameliorator of the lot of Africa (Mr. Wilberforce), he lives. * * * * *

We have heard of divers anomalies in your policy—they are numerous; your treaties, your subsidies, and your prayers; but you yourself are the great anomaly. The continent lay flat before your late rival; the Spaniard had retired; the Austrian had retired; the Prussian had retired; the iron quality of Russia had dissolved; the domination of France had come to the water edge, when, behold! from a misty speck in the west, the avenging genius of these countries issues forth, clutching ten thousand thunders, breaks the spell of France, stops, in his own person, the flying fortunes of the world, sweeps the sea, rights the globe, and then retires in a flame of glory; and, when the human race is in amaze and admiration at his courage and originality, he turns school divine, *fights a battle about extreme unction, and swears against the companions of his fortunes and his victories.*

Our prince is, on the part of his father, the supreme head of the church; we are his national council, and, as such, have a right to advise him. I avail myself of this privilege, and say to him, "My prince, my master, you must take the lead in the deliverance of your people. The graciousness of your manners indicate that you were born for acts of benevolence. Your predecessor, the Plantagenet, prevailed on the continent, so have you; but then he gave the Charter and the laws of the Edwards: your other predecessor, the Tudor, she rescued Holland, so have you; but then she passed wise and useful statutes innumerable. You have carried Europe on your back; but then the home measure, the securing and ascertaining and extending the liberties of your people—that, that still remains. The whole body of the Roman Catholics petition for freedom. The destinies of a fifth of your empire are before you. Come—the glory of the house of Hanover is waiting for you; be the emancipator of the Roman Catholics, as you have been the deliverer of Europe, and look in the face the Tudor and the Plantagenet."

He then moved for a committee; his motion was seconded by the Secretary of the Admiralty (Mr. Croker), who made an ingenious and talented speech; the numbers on the division were 243 to 241, being a majority of 2 only against the Catholics.*

In this state Mr. Grattan left the Catholic question, after a struggle of twenty years in the Irish, and fifteen years in the Imperial Parliament. So slow is the progress of justice when the human faculties are depressed and the mind of the people degraded by tyranny on the one side and slavery on the other. The protracted contest did not however expire with Mr. Grattan, it survived him for nearly ten years. Mr. Plunket followed—(a successor in every way well qualified and worthy of such a cause), he presented the Catholic petition and brought in a bill of relief in 1821, but it was rejected by the House of Lords. Mr. Canning brought in a bill in 1822,

* The debate went off quite unintentionally, Peel and Plunket writing for each other; so that only Grattan and Croker (very cleverly), Leslie, Foster, Lord Normanby, Brownlow, and Beecher, spoke; and I lost my opportunity, with many others.—*Wilberforce's Life*, vol. v.

and it also was rejected in the Lords. Sir Francis Burdett brought in a bill in 1825, and it likewise was rejected in the Lords; these bills, however, were partial in their nature and limited in their extent; at length the people of Ireland, growing more and more indignant at the disregard and treatment which they experienced from their arbitrary and capricious rulers, availed themselves of an omission in the penal law, whereby a Catholic could be elected member of Parliament, though he was not qualified to sit or vote except under a heavy penalty; and when a vacancy took place in 1828, the noble-minded people of Clare, in defiance of every threat and every obstacle, chose as their representative—Daniel O'Connell.*

Then, at the last moment, bigotry yielded—as with a thunderbolt O'Connell smote them, and the Tory ministers were humbled to the dust. Mr. Peel and the Duke of Wellington succumbed to the Irish people, and in 1829 they were compelled to abandon the penal code. But even this measure was accompanied by a heartless, senseless precaution; they excluded Mr. O'Connell who had been elected, and they disfranchised the men who had elected him—the forty shilling freeholders were struck from the constitution, and their representative was driven to a new election after an expense of nearly £20,000; it was thus they ended their career, and in these moments as in all the past, they performed the last reluctant act of relief towards Ireland, without either grace or dignity, with an insult towards the individual, and an injury to the people: how truly did those *statesmen* exemplify the saying of Curran—"The heart of a bigot is not larger than the head of a needle—every thread you put through it seems a cable."

* Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald was the candidate they rejected.

DIARY.

1819.—In the autumn of this year, Mr. Grattan's illness commenced. In August he had gone with a family party to the lakes at Lugela to enjoy the scenery of the Wicklow mountains; the season was remarkably fine, and the younger part of the expedition pitched their tents on the hills for the purpose of shooting, while the remainder staid at the lodge to boat upon the lake or saunter along the walks that at that season were perfumed by the odours of the lime-trees, and the fragrance of the flowering heath;—probably Mr. Grattan was incautious—the dews of the evening and the dampness from the water may have affected him, and shortly after his return to Tinnehinch he began to complain of an oppression on the chest, and a difficulty of breathing.

Parliament had assembled in consequence of the disturbed state of England, and the riots at Manchester had caused the ministry to propose strong measures, seditious bills, and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. Mr. Grattan found himself unable to go over to London. He expressed himself strongly against the Radicals, and would have opposed the extension of these measures to Ireland, as he did not think that the riots and disturbances in England should be a reason for extending the bills to his own country. In the following letter, which was the last he wrote to his friend Day, he alludes to the subject:—

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. JUSTICE DAY.

Tinnehinch, 19th Nov. 1819.

MY DEAR DAY,—I shall wait on you the 27th. I have not, as you see, gone to England, and, as at present informed, don't see the necessity. I have not been well. I have been attacked by an occasional difficulty of breathing, which is teazing though not painful, and presents to the mind the idea of stifling; however, I am better. The Radicals I do not think will destroy liberty, but it is only because they will not succeed, for their proposition would put an end to freedom; first by anarchy, and then by a military government, the necessary result of anarchy.—Yours most truly,

H. GRATTAN.

In the month of December, the oppression and difficulty of breathing increased very much, so Mr. Grattan consulted Dr. Percival and his friend the Surgeon General (Crampton),—their medicines afforded him temporary relief, but his nights were passed with considerable pain, and with little sleep; he got through the winter with some difficulty; his mind appeared singularly active, and his conversation, whether on politics, poetry, or living characters, was peculiarly interesting—at this moment more so than ever.

5th February, 1820.—He spoke much on the subject of religion—said that the question of giving the Bible to the people had been debated at the period of the Reformation, and ably argued. Gardiner said that "it was an experiment—a book translated, on which men would not agree, and from which various sects would spring, and you see it so happened."

On the 30th January, 1820, when the news arrived of the king's death, he observed—"George the III. was a very cunning man—a wrong understanding, but a shrewd one. In Ireland he did nothing that he was not forced to; and, when he got the opportunity, he let the people be tortured, and undid all he had done before; his minister failed in all his undertakings and died in despair." The general election consequent on the death of the sovereign now came on; and that for the city of Dublin took place on the 16th March. Mr. Grattan came to town, but was unable to go to the hustings. He was elected without opposition, and begged me to attend and return thanks to the citizens, and to be chaired in his place. Mr. Murphy and Mr. O'Neill, two friends deputed from his party, waited on him with their congratulations; through them he returned thanks to the citizens for having elected him a sixth time, and went back to Tinnehinch, as he complained of the fogs of the city. The oppression on the chest still continued, and the difficulty of breathing caused great pain; but as spring approached, the weather being very fine, somewhat revived him. When the newspapers came (on 17th March), he read Mr. Lamb's (Lord Melbourne) speech on the hustings in England and praised it; he moved to the window, the sun was shining, and the birds singing; he looked to the mountain, and said, "How delightful the morning—how soft the air feels! how beautiful is nature. The scene tempts one, and makes me almost regret to leave it!" Being unable to walk, he was wheeled out in his chair to a sheltered terrace, bordered by a sweet-briar hedge, his favourite spot, along which he used to pace back and forward, thinking and talking to his friends on politics. After admiring the scene, he said very calmly, "I am going fast, it will not last long." On his return to the house, he asked Berwick, who had come to Tinnehinch, if he had seen his reply to Flood, Berwick said he had. "It is among my papers," said Mr. Grattan, "I do not desire to have it published, but I would be glad it was known that I did not speak the vile abuse that was in the Debates; the business

of '82 was perfect, the treaty was complete—it might have been done some other way, but the way I adopted was sufficient."

He then spoke of that period, and observed—"I have in my mind the characters of Yelverton and Langrishe, it is rather late now to write them, but I could do it, and if I live I shall. I wish to do so, particularly for Yelverton's sake, for he was a great man,—he is not ill-described when I say of him—"*a column of water* 3000 *miles deep.*"* Barrington has drawn his character well, I am sorry I omitted to do it; he possessed a great and powerful mind; its march was like that of an elephant, he mowed down entire battalions; his speaking was *a rage of truth.* As to Corry, I ought to have looked to that reply, but I would not publish it, as the dispute was settled in the field. Berwick knows how it was. My answer was plain,—"*I was an Irishman defending the liberties of my country; you were a man in the pay of England, and you proved it; for you sold your country—you resorted to the most violent measures, which nothing could justify, even to torture!*" He was greatly excited, and accompanied these words with much action, and a bold tone of voice—the effect quite exhausted him—he drooped, and sank, so that Berwick and his friends thought all was over. In the evening he revived, but said, "I am going, it will be but a business of ten days." "Do you remember what Cæsar said on being asked, shortly before his death, what was the best way to die?" he replied, "*a short death, and unexpected.*"

As April advanced (it was his favourite month) he grew somewhat relieved, and his chief wish was to be drawn in the garden chair through his grounds, and along the walks and plantations he had made. 8th of April.—He talked of the folly of England quarrelling with America. "She attempted to tax the colonies, and the attempt ended in an income tax on her own people. She was to have conquered that continent by *Thames barges*, to sail up her rivers, and destroy her fine towns, but that failed—3,000,000 of men drove her back to England in defeat and disgrace, and she was a second time ignominiously beaten—*The justice of Providence is admirable!* He then alluded to Ireland, and said, "You have read Helvetius, a most entertaining work; he justly observes, 'that to keep alive the spirit of liberty, a man must belong to some country'—here, there is no country. England is not our country, it will take a century before she becomes so." He begged to be drawn towards the Dargle, and when he had reached it, he looked wistfully up the wood, and exclaimed,—"Oh! how often I have"—he stopped, and his voice failed; it was along this path that, in younger days, he used to walk and meditate, and stroll along by the soft moonlight, preparing his speeches for the Irish Parliament. He asked to be brought beneath an oak-tree that he had planted, he praised its foliage, and

* Speech on Catholic Question, 1808.—See Vol. IV. Grattan's Speeches, p. 153.

looked as if he bid it farewell for ever, then sunk into a doze. On his return to the house he revived, and commenced speaking of the state of parties in England,—"I fear the opposition party will not come into power, they want able men in the Commons, and there must be a ministry from the Lords." Lord Lansdowne would make a good minister, he is an excellent man. Lord Holland has the best of hearts. As to the present ministers they are a poor set; in fact, the Duke of Wellington made them, he not only made them, but he made Europe; and all that he now should take care of, is not to unmake himself—a man is not tried until he comes into prosperity. It is more difficult to stand on a summit than to reach it. He will become an object of jealousy, and ministers would be glad to bring him down to their own level. It is to be regretted that he has taken such a line against the Catholics; it has injured him; his speech, however, is not so bad as people say; he is not a decided enemy, and thinks that emancipation might take place consistent with certain securities; his conduct in presenting petitions against them was erroneous and ill-judged.

Mr. Grattan's illness increased, he grew more and more desirous to get to London. "I wish," said he, "to take my seat and speak on two subjects—Reform and the Catholic. I fear that the radicals will put down the principles of liberty. The Government and the House of Lords on the one side—the radicals on the other—would put down all freedom. The Lords have no right to interfere with the Commons in their efforts to amend their representation; the boroughs should be reduced; Parliament should do as Lord William Russell proposed in the case of Grampound, and disfranchise such boroughs, this would soon create a reform, and the Lords should not resist this retrenchment; they have no right to oppose the reform of the Lower House. On the other question, I would strive to do something for the country; it is a monstrous thing that one sect should proscribe another." April the 10th.—He wished to be taken into the demesne of Lord Powerscourt; when he came to the stream, near an old church-yard, he stopped and admired the beauty of the scene. I told him this is the place we used to walk to on Sunday mornings and repeat Homer and Virgil,—"Oh, yes, do you remember that? it is a pretty spot!" Some wood-pigeons flew out of an ivy-tree close by, on which he quoted immediately—

"Timidæ ubi posuêre nidum columbæ."

He then added, in a feeling tone—"Ah, poor things, you need not fly—it is I who have more reason to be afraid."

Afterwards he entered into a description of Burnet's history. "He is a very entertaining historian, his characters are well drawn:" then he spoke of the conduct of Charles the II.—"He was a tyrant, and a tyrant in the pay of the enemy; he was a bad king and belonged to a bad race, but he was a man of talent and out-generalled the whigs;

they behaved ill and gave him many advantages over them. The Stuart family was a bad one—to Ireland they did no good—Ireland certainly has been sadly treated. The Protestant strove to keep up the connection and fight for the religion and property of the English settlers, and their reward was the loss of their liberty; in their contests they always acted as a colony, surrendering their freedom or not preferring their rights in order to save their property; they were a colony, in fact when they excluded the Catholics, they reduced themselves to nothing. 15th April.—He grew very restless and impatient; his appetite was nearly gone, but his strength revived occasionally and surprised every one. He said he would go to town and see some of the leading friends of the Catholics—Lord Fingall, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. M'Donnell, and then to London by slow journies,—"for though I cannot speak I can make the motion. I owe it to the public good—to the interests of the body that has trusted me, and to my own memory. I have the motion in my mind—two resolutions, one declaring the determination to uphold the Protestant religion, and the other to grant their liberties to the Catholics. I will do it. I am not without hope. It may lay the ground for some future measure. I wish to see Plunket and write to Lord Fingall on the subject. The country should not entertain any wild notions of a new condition in alliance with any foreign power. She would be in such a case merely a West India colony to some arbitrary country; she is not certainly what she was before the union; her pride is lowered, and she does not stand so high."

16th April.—On this day he again went in his little carriage towards the waterfall. He was very nervous, and his breathing was very much oppressed. He stopped at the river side, near one of his favourite walks, and asked for a draught of water; then he cheered up, and turning to Mr. Berwick, who was with him, said,—"Doctor, do you know this day?—this is the 16th of April;" and with great energy and spirit said; "yes, this was a great day; it was the day I carried the claim of *Right* in '82;" and with much humour added, "you shall drink it, Doctor, and we shall give you a bottle of claret."

21st April.—He came to Dublin. He had a consultation with four physicians; they all agreed that he would not be able to go to Parliament, and they wrote down the result of their consultation. He, however, insisted, and said to them,—"Doctors, you are right. I will, however, go. We are both right—you, in ordering me to stay, and I, in deciding to go." Doctor Perceval said that he should lose no time; that the organs of respiration were disordered, and symptoms of dropsy were beginning to develope themselves. Every exertion, mental or bodily, should be avoided; and if he went to England he must take on himself the entire responsibility. He heard this without the slightest emotion; but after the phy-

sicians had gone he said, "They have passed sentence—I shall go to England;" then turning to me,—"Don't you think I am right?—yes, *it was a sentence.*"

22nd April.—He desired me to write to Sir Henry Parnell that he would be in London early in May, and to give notice that he would bring on the Catholic question on the 10th of the month. His energies now seemed revived, and his spirits quite surprising. He said, "Go to Bishop Troy: ask him about the Pope's letter on the Bible Societies, and how far his Holiness has expressed his opinion about the circulation of the bible."*

25th April.—His appetite declined; his limbs swelled, and the disposition to sleep increased, and the doctors gave him digitalis. "I am now in a bad way, but I will get to London. I have been very ill for six weeks; but *if God grants me only one month more to do the business, I am sure I shall be very thankful!* I will do my duty. I will make the motion you wrote out for me, and then I will make my bow."

28th April.—The spasms returned, and he could get no repose. About two in the morning he asked me to bring him Swift's works and I read some part to him. When I came to the letter to Lord Molesworth about *the dependency of Ireland*, he listened with much attention; and when I read that part relating the story of the judge's hide that had been stuffed for his son to sit upon, and Swift's remark,†—"I wish he had told us how many such there might be," Mr. Grattan said, "Very good; full of point that." There was in the volume an account of the debate in the English House of Commons on the 6th of George the First, relating to the dependency of Ireland: this subject awoke his faculties; and on coming to Sir Joseph Jekell's speech, where he calls "Ireland a conquered country," Mr. Grattan said, "Pshaw—nonsense; don't read any more."

He returned to Tinnehinch, and next day sent to town to arrange matters preparatory to his going to Parliament; but after a few days he grew so weak that he feared he could not undertake the

* This subject has been, on most occasions, falsely and maliciously stated. The Catholics do not object to the reading the Holy Scriptures, but they very properly object to an indiscriminate use of the book. They publish and circulate thousands of copies, yet members in Parliament are constantly showing their ignorance by asserting the contrary.

† I have read somewhere of an eastern king who put a judge to death for an iniquitous sentence, and ordered *his hide to be stuffed into a cushion*, and placed on the tribunal for the son to sit on, who was transferred to the father's office. I fancy such a memorial might not have been unuseful to a son of Sir William Scroggs, and that both he and his successors would often *wriggle* in their seats as long as the cushion lasted. I wish the relator had told us what number of such cushions there might be in that country.—*Swift's Works*, vol. vii.

journey. "Ah," said he, turning to his son James, "I am disappointed—sadly disappointed—this is my death-blow!"

He was again taken out in his chair, and I gathered some flowers and offered them to him; but he said, "I do not desire to hear a bird sing once more, or smell a flower again. I am indeed disappointed." As he grew weaker, I felt the pulsation of his heart; the physicians had said that was the seat of the disease. "How does it beat?" said he, "I wish it would beat no more." He then requested to be brought through his plantations; and as he passed along said, "This is a monk's place,—the genius of the valley. I made this place, and I was fond of it; it cost me many pleasant and anxious hours. I was assisted by an old friend and labourer (Savage), and I may say these trees and this soil are of my creation: it has been rather spoiled where the hedge and road have scarred a pretty hill, but everything else is improved; it has a park-look, and is so retired and cool, it gives me pleasure to go round it and see the old spots, and revisit even for the last time, the place of my younger days: thirty-six years since I came here." Then, after a pause, he said, in a calm and gentle tone,—"What a pleasing reflection it is for me that I have taken an independent part through life. I can look back without reproach. *I know what I have done, and what others have not done; it is a great consolation—it is a second immortality.*"

Every day one of his daughters read prayers to him, and chapters from the Bible. He admired in particular the Book of Isaiah; and at the conclusion of one of the chapters he said, "I fear if I had not read this book before, it would be of little service to me to do so now. I can do nothing of myself. I prostrate myself, with all my sins, at the foot of the cross, and I trust to the mercy of my Redeemer."

30th April, (Sunday).—Mr. Berwick, who watched him with every care and attention, read prayers to him, and administered the sacrament. All the members of his family attended. After the ceremony he said, "I have lived long enough. My friends are dead, and I leave the world in good time; but all your kindness makes me almost regret it." The pain and difficulty of breathing had greatly increased, and he suffered extremely; he then exclaimed, "It will soon be over; life is not worth having on these terms."

On the 5th of May he grew worse—he could not rest, and the spasmodic affections increased. Towards the morning (for we sat up with him all night), he begged to be brought outside the window. He made my brother and me sit down by him. "I am never happy now without one of you at each side." He took our hands, and held them for a long time. "Oh! poor fellows; I am sorry to leave you." As the morning broke, he looked up and exclaimed, "How fine the opening of the day appears;" then he began to repeat the lines of Johnson,—"*Fears of the brave, and follies of the wise;*" he repeated them to himself several times. Plunket called on him; and Charles Bushe shortly after came; they were much affected. When his old

friend Day saw him, Mr. Grattan said, "He is the best hearted man alive. Well, I die like a gentleman, with all my old and respected friends around me."

6th May.—He grew more and more anxious about the Catholics; said he wanted to see a deputation, and receive the address they had agreed to present to him;* that he would write to them his "*valedictory advice.*" He became so ill that he was obliged to give up the idea of going to England, and desired me to write to Sir Henry Parnell to put off the notice of motion from the 11th to the 15th. Parnell postponed it to the 25th, and ultimately adjourned it *sine die.*

On the 12th of May, having rallied a little in the country, he returned to Dublin, said he would receive the Catholic Deputation, and go to England. He got me to write to Mr. Plunket, Burrowes, and Day, and beg of them to come to him the day the deputation were to call. He arranged to receive six, and wished Lord Trimleston and Sir Edward Bellew to be of the number. I accordingly wrote, and Mr. O'Gorman, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Costigan, Mr. Howley, and Mr. O'Connell came. Mr. McDonnell was to have come, but he was accidentally absent. Mr. Grattan received them with

* At a meeting of Catholic gentlemen, on Saturday, pursuant to adjournment, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Bart., in the Chair, the following Address and Answer was read:—

Sir,—We have learned with deep affliction, that your health has been of late much impaired, and that your physicians deem your intended journey to England for the present unadvisable. The object of that journey is avowed, and is one which revives and increases those sentiments of lively gratitude and profound attachment which we have ever entertained towards you, and we cannot more suitably express the sincerity of those sentiments than by most earnestly and anxiously entreating that you will postpone that journey, of which our liberties are the great object.

We have, therefore, a right to conjure you to spare yourself for your afflicted country, and to await a more favourable, and, we trust, an early opportunity, of advocating our cause with renewed health.

For and on the part of the Meeting,

Randall M'Donnell, Chairman.
N. P. O'Gorman, Secretary.

Right Hon. Henry Grattan.

Stephen's Green, May 5, 1820.

Gentlemen,—I thank you much for your solicitude on my account. I did intend to bring on your question speedily, but I feel that this is at present impossible; I shall endeavour to bring it on in a reasonable time, such as may suit the convenience of the parties concerned.

Nothing but physical impossibility shall prevent me, as I consider that my last breath belongs to my country.—I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your very obedient humble servant,

Henry Grattan.

I hope, in the course of next week, to be able to write to you more fully on the important subject alluded to in your Address.

much civility. The members of his family were around him, together with Mr. Day, Mr. (Lord) Plunket, and Peter Burrowes. He told the Deputation that "he feared he would not live to carry their question; that he had been most anxious to be the instrument to set their country free; that he greatly regretted his bad health; that he would go over to Parliament; that his last breath belonged to his country:" he then read the paper.* The Deputation was very polite and kind. Mr. O'Connell approached him, and said how much he regretted the state of his health. Having retired to an adjoining room, they wished to see Mr. Burrowes, and begged he would persuade Mr. Grattan not to go to Parliament. On considering the matter in their committee-room, some of them were dissatisfied at the letter, and said the advice therein was not required. However, the moderate and wiser part prevailed, and the document was in general approved of.

Preparations were now made to go to England; his friends came then to take leave of him. Berwick had not seen him for some days, and was shocked at the change in his appearance. He threw his arm round his neck, and bade him farewell. "I always had a great love for you," said Mr. Grattan, "and you know I am not afraid of death. I will fall at my post. Good bye!—*remember!*—*remember!*" laying an emphasis on the words. Berwick, being asked what he meant, he stated that he wished to be buried in a retired church-yard at Moyanna, in the Queen's County, situated on the estate which he had got from the people in 1782; that he had given him the direction, as he could not bear to tell it to his family.

* Stephen's Green, May 13, 1820.

GENTLEMEN,—I avail myself of your Deputation to give you a very decisive opinion touching the interests of the Roman Catholic Body.

I am convinced that it is their policy, as well as their duty, and I am sure it is their disposition, to maintain a perpetual connexion with the British Empire.

To keep clear of every association with wild projectors, for universal suffrage and annual Parliaments, and continue to cultivate those gracious dispositions in the Royal Breast which had been early manifested in their favour, and to accept of Emancipation upon the terms that are substantial and honourable; pursuing such a principle, and with the temper and conduct which they are manifesting, and which I am proud to contemplate, they must succeed.

They desire a privilege to worship their God according to the best of their judgment, and they have a right to do so with impunity, and without the interference of the State.

I shall go to England for your Question, and should the attempt prove less fortunate to my health, I shall be more than repaid by the reflection that I make my last effort for the liberty of my country.—I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your very obedient and attached humble servant.

HENRY GRATTAN.

To the Gentlemen composing the Deputation appointed by the Meeting of Roman Catholics.

He grew so ill that his friends entreated of him not to go to London, and Burrowes came to dissuade him, but he was inexorable. He was now in great pain; his legs had swelled, and a discharge issued from them, and blisters were applied to his back, which from the peculiar tenderness of his skin, gave him excruciating pain. The night before he left Ireland, he was much agitated; and at 5 o'clock in the morning of the 21st of May he exclaimed, "I am dying; I have suffered much. I have passed four sad months! How true those words are, '*that man is made to mourn;*' but it is better to go now than in a year or two to have all this trouble over again. When I am gone you will all live together. Your sister* is a person of talent. Your mother an excellent woman, — sensible and honest-minded; her conduct has been exemplary: her religion supported and consoled her under all her trials. As for you, *be just and honest, and God will take care of you.*"

On the 20th of May he left Dublin. The people assembled round his carriage, and the quay was lined with crowds cheering him when he got on board. Burrowes, Humphreys, Mr. Rothe, Mr. O'Gorman, Howley, Lord Meath, and a number of friends were there. Mr. Grattan asked for some wine, and drank the health of the citizens of Dublin. After a very painful passage he arrived at Liverpool the next day. Here the people crowded to the quay, and sought to take the horses from the carriage and draw him to the hotel. The Catholics sent a deputation with an address, but his doctor (Gason), who throughout was most kind and attentive, would not allow him to see more than two of the body (Mr. Moore and Mr. O'Connor). His reply to them was short. They were much affected at beholding the state he was in. Being unable to bear the motion of the carriage, an open boat was hired and fitted up with matting and canvass, and in it he proceeded by the Canal to London, stopping for the night at the adjacent villages.

The kindness of a gentleman of the name of Adam, who resided near Rugby deserves to be acknowledged. Hearing that Mr. Grattan had left Liverpool by the canal, he watched the boats till he found him, and now intreated him to come to his house, which he had prepared for his reception; but Mr. Grattan was too anxious to proceed, so we thanked this hospitable individual, and continued our course. His kindness formed a strong contrast to the treatment that was experienced at Berkhampstead, where, at a late hour, we in vain strove to procure admittance at any of the inns. We stated Mr. Grattan's illness, but the proprietors were inexorable. We offered twenty pounds for a room, but even then could not be accommodated, so we were obliged to go on all night in the open boat, having wrapped up Mr. Grattan in cloaks and coverings to keep off the cold air.

* Mrs. Blachford, afterwards Lady Carnwath.

The Reverend Richard Marlay, son of his old friend Colonel Marlay, had accompanied us to England. Mr. Grattan entertained a great and just regard for him and for his father; and one evening, after the tedious journey in the boat, when the party got to an inn for the night, he gave an interesting account of his conduct in 1782, when the Colonel advised him to persevere, and urge the question of Ireland's independence, in defiance of every obstacle. He then related, very drolly, an anecdote of one of the Tory governments offering Colonel Marlay a place; the latter replied, that he had no objection to take office, because he might, perhaps, do the country some good; but one thing he wished Government to know, that if he took office, he would be under the necessity of opposing them, as he entirely disapproved of their measures; this Mr. Grattan related with much spirit and humour.

At Rugby a mortification began to appear in one of his legs, and his physician applied barm to delay it. When he came to Stony Stratford it increased very much. We were much shocked at it. "What!" exclaimed he, "do you think I dread this?—it does not terrify me. I'll go to the House. I have carried my point. I see the leg is mortifying; but I am only a few miles from London. I shall propose my resolutions, and tell the Catholics that *if I cannot speak, I can pray for them. I shall then die contented.*" Some difficulty occurring in proceeding farther by water, he objected to the delay, and insisted on getting a carriage; the doctor having desired the postilion to drive slow, he requested they should go at their ordinary rate.

On Wednesday, the 31st of May, he arrived in London. He then exclaimed, "I have now gained a victory!" Doctor Baillie, Surgeon-General (Crampton), and his friend Tegart, came immediately to see him: they were shocked at the rapid increase of the mortification, and strove to dissuade him from going to the House of Commons, but he remained unmoved.

On the 1st of June Lord Hutchinson came. Mr. Grattan took him by the hand. Hutchinson was greatly shocked at his appearance, and began to weep. "My dear Lord," said Mr. Grattan, "I am going to die. I am happy to see you. You are a man of spirit and of principle; you have an independent mind, and love liberty." Lord Hutchinson told him he was going that evening with Mr. Brougham to St. Omer, on the business of the Queen. The King was an old friend of mine, and I could not refuse him. "How is he?" said Mr. Grattan. "Very well," replied Lord Hutchinson. "I am glad of it," observed Mr. Grattan. "Do not let the Queen annoy him. I respect him as my sovereign, and I love him as a gentleman. How does he feel *towards us*?" "That," said Lord Hutchinson, "is a subject which neither of us have as yet spoken on. Our mouths are shut; but I know nothing which shows any indication of friendly disposition." "That is a pity,"

said Mr. Grattan. "I am sorry for it. I wish I may live to be of public service. I shall try to record my sentiments. You know them, Hutchinson,—to preserve the connexion between the two countries, and grant the Catholics their just privileges. I shall go to the House, and move these resolutions; they are prospective. Am I not right?" "Yes," said Lord Hutchinson. "How is Doctor Parr?" "Very well," replied Lord Hutchinson. "I hear of him from Cockburne," said Mr. Grattan. "Cockburne* is a man of spirit, and a lover of liberty; his mind is independent." Mr. Grattan then spoke of Flood, and the manner in which he died. Flood had desired his friends to leave him for a moment, and when they returned they found him dead. "He was an extraordinary man," said Mr. Grattan; "a man of great talent and abilities. I should be glad it was known that I did not speak the vile abuse that is reported."

Lord Donoughmore and Sir John Newport came to see him: the latter strove to dissuade him from going to the House, particularly as it was a new parliament, he must take the oaths before the House met. Mr. Grattan, however, said, "I shall go. I am right. I shall make an exertion for the liberties of my countrymen, and I shall be thankful to Providence if I can be of service to the empire."

2nd of June.—Dr. Butler came—Mr. Grattan asked him about the Catholic question; said that he would make his last effort on their behalf; that he came for that purpose from Ireland. Dr. Butler was much affected, and, pressing his hand, said—Nothing, Sir, can be nobler than such conduct. In the evening he grew worse, but his faculties clear as ever. 3rd of June.—He still persisted to go to the House. The Speaker† having been consulted on the subject, said, in the most obliging manner, that he would give every facility, and that Mr. Grattan should have the use of his house, and any apartments he desired. His second daughter (afterwards Mrs. Wake) requested him, in the most earnest manner, not to attempt it, and, throwing her arms around him, said—that effort would cost him his life. On that, he calmly replied—"*My life*,—"my love—God gave me talents to be of use to my country, and if I lose my life in her service, *it is a good death*"—repeating it with emphasis, "*it is a good death.*" At length Crampton (whose kindness was excessive) and Tegart, his old friend, dissuaded him from going.

Mr. Blake‡ then called upon him. Mr. Grattan took him by the hand—Ah! Mr. Blake, I wish I could accomplish what I came over for, they tell me I am too weak, so that if I cannot speak for

* General Sir George Cockburne, a friend and neighbour in the County of Wicklow.

† Mr. C. M. Sutton, afterwards Lord Canterbury.

‡ Afterwards Chief Remembrancer in Ireland, a most attached friend.

you, I must pray, *you* will succeed, but keep clear of the radicals and the queen.

How is Lord Wellesley? I hope he is well? we were old friends in our younger days; tell him I love him. How is the Duke of Norfolk? pray, say how much I respect him. Mr. Blake said that Lord Wellesley would go to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant; at this Mr. Grattan was much pleased, and observed, "That prognosticates good." His old friend, Sir John Doyle, called, but he was unable to see him, and, being exhausted, sunk into sleep. In the mean time Lord Castlereagh called, and when Mr. Grattan awoke I told him of it, and that I had gone out to speak to him. On this he commenced a singular conversation, and with settled composure ended in the following manner:—"If you get into the House of Commons, I must beg of you not to attack Lord Castlereagh. The Union has passed. The business between him and me is over, and it is for the interests of Ireland that Lord Castlereagh should be minister. I must again request of you not to attack him unless he attacks you, *and I make it my dying request.* As to the Union, you know the principle of my speech against Corry—the business being decided otherwise, I would not have recourse to publication—the fact was I found the government in a league to sell the country—I told them so. I opposed them. *I stood up for Ireland, and I was right!*" Here his eye kindled, his countenance brightened, and he "raised his arm as he uttered this with surprising firmness and spirit, then shortly after said—"As to *my* person, I wish to be laid in Moyanna. I would rather be buried there." I then told him that it was the intention to place him in Westminster Abbey. "Oh," said he, "that will not be thought of, I would rather have Moyanna." He was now so much enfeebled that it was clear he could not carry his intention into effect, or indeed survive much longer. He said, "this is a sad disappointment." 4th of June.—Mr. Blake came with a message from the Duke of Sussex, that it was the wish of some of his friends that his remains should be taken to Westminster Abbey. Blake asked my opinion, and I told him Mr. Grattan's wishes to be buried on the lands given to him by the people of Ireland. I then went to him and found all the family around him; at this moment he was so careful not to offend their feelings that, when Mr. Blake made the communication, he begged the ladies might retire, and then said, well—"Westminster Abbey." He then ordered me to get the paper * which I had written for him on the Catholic question, and said, add to it these words, "*I die with a love of liberty in my heart, and this declaration in favour of my*

* This paper contained his last recommendations to Ireland, not to seek for any connection except with Great Britain; and to England, to repeal the civil and political disabilities against the Catholics. It was read in the House when the writ was moved for Dublin.—*Grattan's Speeches*, vol. i. p. 74.

country in my hand." He then said, it will do, I should wish it to be read in the House; give my love to Plunket, he will do it. After this he grew very weak—got his family close around him—bowed down his head, and at six o'clock on the 4th of June he expired. That day forty years before, the volunteers of Ireland had presented to him an Address for asserting the liberties of Ireland.

LORD HOLLAND TO MISS FOX.

June 20, 1820.

DEAREST LITTLE SISTER,—Lady Holland is still ill, she has a bad cold. Pray, convey to Mrs. Blachford and her brother my best thanks for their kindness in thinking of me, when they are necessarily and naturally overwhelmed by so many and such painful occupations. I am not the least the worse for the fatigue and cold of that melancholy ceremony*—and I am the better in one respect for having attended it—as I have the satisfaction of having done my utmost to show my unfeigned respect for the memory of Grattan, of whose genius I had the greatest admiration, and in whose wisdom and goodness I had the greatest confidence, and for whom I had really more personal affection and regard than the few opportunities that I had of cultivating his friendship would seem to satisfy me in expressing. Never did a man close a more honourable career more generally regretted, admired, and loved.

H.

A statue, by Chantrey, was erected by private subscription, and placed in the Royal Exchange, Dublin. The Duke of Leinster, the Latouches, Judge Day, James Corry, Anthony Blake, and a number of attached friends, were instrumental in effecting this public object.

* Mr. Grattan was interred next to Fox in Westminster Abbey; the funeral was public, and attended by the leading men of all parties: the Dukes of Sussex, Wellington, Norfolk, and Devonshire; Lords Harrowby, Holland, Downshire, Donoughmore; W. Fitzgerald, Castlereagh (by proxy), Wellesley, Erskine, Landsdowne; the Members of the Catholic Board, and the Children of the Catholic Charity Schools. — *Grattan's Speeches*, vol. i. p. 60.

READER

WHOEVER THOU ART

LEARN

FROM THESE PAGES

HOW TO LIVE AND HOW TO DIE.

REMEMBER

THE FIRST GREAT DUTY IS TO THY GOD;

THE NEXT

TO THY COUNTRY.

HENRY GRATTAN.

THE ABBEY, CELBRIDGE, IRELAND,
17*th March*, 1846.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

The following letters refer to an important part of the History of Ireland. They contain sound remarks and good principles, useful for those who administer the affairs of this country, and therefore are worthy of being inserted.

Right Hon. Henry Grattan to Richard Burke, Jun., Esq.

March 20, 1793.

My dear Sir,—The Popery bill this day came from the Lords, and was agreed to by the Commons, with its silly amendments. One amendment raised the qualification to carry arms from 100*l.* to 300*l.*, as if any man who had only 299*l.* should expose his property to the highwayman and housebreaker. It was proposed by Fitzgibbon, in that spirit of peevish littleness, which prompts him to offend where he dare not resist. On the whole, those labours which in the last year appeared hopeless, and were arduous and perilous, are now crowned. You have reason to applaud your own conduct and enterprise, and to deride those inhospitable and bigoted attacks which, in the former year, were directed against your cause and your exertions. I do not think England can call Ireland Bœtia, nor yet a land of slaves, while the name of your family exists in the success of its labours, or the fruits of its genius. You saw the debates in the Lords. The Bishop of Killaloe asserted the liberality of his country and his philosophy; his exertion was a little dashed with the enthusiast, as Fitzgibbon's was with the attorney; but the enthusiast has the advantage. The Bishop, who had no law, was the Statesman; the lawyer, who had no religion, was the bigot. You would have been amused with those debates; you who heard the debates, and were witness to the horrid shouts, of the last Session. On the credit of the Popery bill, the Irish administration has stood. I think, however, that the Catholics have not the least faith in

them. They consider the concession as the immediate order of the King. I am not sorry for it, because I am a friend to the monarchy, and I am no friend to the Irish ministers. The Session hitherto has been entirely engrossed by the Catholic bill, and the business of supply, army and militia. Our principle was to give Government (ill as we thought of the Irish ministers) every thing they themselves desired; putting in at the same time, our claim for certain concessions to be discussed when the immediate exigencies were fulfilled. It was a slow, but, I am convinced, an effectual, and surely a safe method of redressing grievances.

I write to your father by to-morrow's post—Believe me, my dear Sir, yours most sincerely,

H. GRATTAN.

RIGHT HON. HENRY GRATTAN TO THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE.

Dublin, March 25th, 1793.

MY DEAR SIR,—You judge perfectly right in supposing the Roman Catholics have gotten everything; they have so. They have gotten the greater part in possession, and the remainder in a certain and approaching reversion. The Lords were almost unanimous. Bishops voted, and some spoke for toleration; even our chancellor* voted for the bill, though he spoke against it. He had, at the opening of the session, rebuked the King for his credulity to the groundless (as he thought) statements of the Catholic petition; on the bill, he left the department of the law, and resorted to that of a school divine; he tried to prove from canons, that a Roman Catholic must ever wish to depose a Protestant king, and ever have an interest distinct from a Protestant people. Under this impression, he thought it fatal to give the Roman Catholics seats in parliament, but was ready, and thought it safe, to give them the other powers and privileges of the constitution; and this concession he declared was in consideration of the times. In his abhorrence of his father's religion, he forgot all respect for his own, and personally and petulantly attacked a Protestant bishop, speaking with unusual liberality and talent. He forgot also that, by his speech, he diminished the reconciliatory effects of the bill, by thus informing the Catholics that though the Irish law ceased to be their enemy, the Irish minister continued to be so.† Our speaker was supposed to have spoken best against the Catholic bill; he did so, but said nothing. He predicated the immediate ruin of the state, and he prophesied the approaching ruin of the church. His grounds were a supposed disregard in the Catholics for the

* Lord Fitzgibbon, afterwards Lord Clare. † Mr. Foster.

obligation of an oath. A day or two after his speech, he proposed to save the state from the evil of their votes, by resorting to their oaths; and introduced into the bill, as a satisfactory oath, their own declaration. The Irish administration were saved by their enemies, the Catholics and the Opposition; had they not yielded to the one and been spared by the other, the treachery of their own ranks would have destroyed them; but those exertions necessary to ruin a minister must have produced a fever. I believe we were right in going considerable lengths to support the former rather than produce the latter. The minister supported our great measure; we supported him. We have, among measures of expense and power, passed a militia bill. I own I was very glad that measure was postponed until the Catholic bill was safe, and had not been sorry had it been postponed until the impending settlement was adjusted. But in that bill it was curious to observe the folly of religion; (I mean of Protestant bigotry without any religion :) they had introduced the bill with a clause, disqualifying in its effects any Catholic from being in the militia, unless he had 10*l.* a year freehold, or 100*l.* in money, or could get a licence. As the Protestant ascendancy had once conceived a free constitution without a people, so here it conceived a militia without men. They thought they had gotten, under the name of a national militia, an army against a great portion of the nation. However, the clause was stricken out, and men became admissible in the militia. I mentioned a settlement; to make it, I understand, certain officers proceed to England; so, it is understood here, they are to settle constitution and commerce; some of them are not enemies to both, but it is an anxious undertaking. The object can only be to give satisfaction: but to do so, they must do something that is substantial. I remember in 1780, a perpetual mutiny bill in Ireland was called a settlement, and was that kind of settlement which employed two years to agitate and to unsettle. There are some bills, the consideration of which has been postponed, that they, I suppose, might be arranged. They are a pension, place, and responsibility bill. The principle of all of them is indispensable, and they ought to be substantially and honestly granted. It were idle to begin an arrangement without any view, save only to gratify; and then so to cripple the measures as to inflame the passions and entail opposition from session to session. In short, we are (and when I say we, I mean a great phalanx of the Opposition), so situate with respect to the great principle, (I speak not of the mechanism of these bills), that a substantial compliance must be very grateful to us, and an inadequate or evasive measure, intolerable. You may have an opportunity to do us service. Our ambassadors sail to-morrow—I hope to do good.

I wrote to your son last post; he has had a triumph. He stood the friend of the Catholic in both countries, when it appeared fruitless in the one and formidable in the other.

Mrs. Grattan joins me in requesting to be remembered to Mrs. Burke, and begs not to be forgotten to you.—I am, my dear sir, with the highest regard and admiration, yours most sincerely,

H. GRATTAN.

RIGHT HON. HENRY GRATTAN TO THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE.

August 26, 1794.

MY DEAR SIR,—May I be permitted to sympathize where I cannot presume to console?

The misfortunes of your family are a public care; the late one is to me a personal loss*. I have a double right to affliction, and to join my grief, and to express my deep and cordial concern at that hideous stroke which has deprived me of a friend, you of a son, and your country of a promise that you would communicate to posterity the living blessings of your genius and your virtue. Your friends may now condole with you, that you should have now no other prospect of immortality than that which is common to Cicero or to Bacon; such as can never be interrupted while there exists the beauty of order, or the love of virtue; and can fear no death, except what barbarity may impose on the globe. If the same strength of reason which could persuade any other man to bear any misfortune, can administer to the proprietor in his own case a few drops of comfort, we may hope that your condition admits of relief. The greatest possible calamity which can be imposed on man, we hope, may be supported by the greatest human understanding. For comfort your friends must refer you to the exercise of its faculties, and to the contemplation of its gigantic proportions—*Dura solatia*—of which nothing can deprive you while you live; and though death should mow down everything about you, and plunder you of your domestic existence, you would still be the owner of a conscious superiority in life, and an immortality after it.—I am, my dear Sir, with the highest respect and regard, yours most truly,

H. GRATTAN.

I am to request, on Mrs. Grattan's part and mine, that you will express to Mrs. Burke how anxious we are that her strength may support her in this dreadful trial.

* Death of Mr. Burke's son.

Henry Grattan, Esq., to the Right Hon. Edmund Burke.

September, 1794.

My dear Sir,—I was favoured with your letter of the 21st. I had left Ireland before the other arrived.

Surely nothing could be more unseasonable or improper than to appoint to the provostship any man who is not such as you describe,—a statutable academical character. I believe that the new Irish administration will adhere to that principle. I judge from their character and their general intentions; and I do hope most ardently that they will stop the recommendations of the existing Government, if they should depart from that line. Report said that our present Attorney-General* meditated a retreat from the labours of the state to the government of the University. Should such a recommendation take place, I make no doubt it will be resisted. The late provost,† whom you knew well, betook himself to such a retreat; and for fifteen years of it never enjoyed the repose of a moment. An ingenious and an accomplished man, he was almost stung to death by intruding himself into the hive of the academy. The members of it have a natural right to reap their own harvest, and to wear their own laurels. They are, many of them, of great learning, and best fitted to govern themselves. I shall not fail to mention the subject, if I see any danger of a foreign appointment.

I had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Hussey, who told me that you had been so kind as to write to me to Ireland. He mentioned the subject of colleges as having interested your attention. On that, or any subject, I shall be most happy to receive your instructions, which I shall always reverence; and believe me, my dear Sir, with the greatest regard, yours most truly,

H. Grattan.

Henry Grattan, Esq., to the Right Hon. Edmund Burke.

October 1, 1794.

My dear Sir,—I think I know that it is the wish of the Duke of Portland to confine the provostship to the Universites, and I imagine no recommendation from Lord Westmoreland to the contrary will have the smallest effect. I can't say I have heard his Grace on the subject; but from what I hear, I think I may be certain of his sentiments. The Fellows of the University have sent a deputation; they were with his Grace some days ago. Whether there was not a job in that very deputation, I am not certain; but it was suspected that its object was to

* Arthur Wolfe, afterwards Lord Kilwarden. † Hutchinson.

direct the attention of Government to one who had been once a Fellow, but is now a married man, and a Fellow no longer.

The other point which has occurred to you is certainly of much moment also. It is absolutely necessary to allow the Catholic clergy a Catholic education at home. If they can't have a Catholic education at home, they can have none at all, or none which is not dangerous. I don't think any time should be lost; too much time has been lost already, both with regard to their education and Irish education in general; for which great funds, of public, royal, and private donation, have been granted and eaten. There is not one great public school in Ireland; and yet the funds are great, but sunk in the person of the master, who is a species of monster, devouring the youth he should educate and the charity he is entrusted to preserve. At the time when our Government were assuming public ignorance as an argument against Catholic emancipation, there lay before them a report of a committee with authentic evidence of this misapplication, in which they persisted to connive, in common with those false guardians of our youth who had great schools, no scholars, and had just interest enough to overbalance the chances of the rising generation. Such subjects are now peculiarly interesting, when the fortunes of the world are in the scale, and the intellectual order in some danger of kicking the beam.

We were afraid to touch the subject hitherto, lest administration might turn upon us, and swallow up all the jobs we would correct in one vast job of their own. Happy should I be, at any time, to learn from you on these subjects. You may—I hope not—but you may have lost the power of being happy; you retain the power of being eminently useful.—I am, my dear Sir, with the greatest regard and esteem, yours most sincerely,

H. GRATTAN.

HENRY GRATTAN, ESQ., TO THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE.

March 14, 1795.

MY DEAR SIR,—You would have served them, but they were not to be served. You would have healed wounds, private and public. There is more wisdom in your ardour, than in their cold and over-reaching discretion. I lament it. I lament it on account of Ireland, on account of England, and on account of the best man I ever knew,—Lord Fitzwilliam. It is now the established principle of the British Cabinet, that Irish jobbers and Irish jobs are sacred; and that whatever redress we may look to, can be only obtained by peremptory and hostile demand. That Mr. Pitt should have behaved so, I am not

astonished; but that the Duke of Portland—the Duke of Portland,—a name I must persist, from my recollections of 1782, still almost to regard,—that he should have used us so,—that he should have deserted Ireland,—deserted his friend,—and have thrown the former into a fever, and have left the latter in solitude,—is astonishing. No subject on which he was more decided than the removal of Beresford. He admired the facility with which Pitt had given him up. He entered with indignation against his system of jobbing; and I should have thought would have removed us, if we had not removed him. If he blames us for our efforts to correct abuses in the administration of Irish government, let him blame himself also, who told us that he undertook a share in the Government, principally with a view to correct abuses in Ireland. What are we to think of the faith of most reputed Englishman? What can his Grace say to his friend—to his friend Lord Fitzwilliam—whom he induced to accept the government of this country, in which he has been disgraced; and to his own relations here, whom he has left to a long opposition war, with every personal and every public provocation? But Lord Camden and Mr. Pelham are to heal all this. I doubt it. They will have the Parliament, but they have lost the nation. I had written a letter to Mr. Windham, but I did not send it; it had been of no use. I regard him much; I wish to stand well in his opinion, if any Irishman can stand well in the opinion of a member of the English Cabinet. Could I have hoped that these sentiments had any chance of being adopted by his brethren, I should have gone to England at his suggestion; but I apprehend there was a determination conceived long ago to extinguish the Duke of Portland's pretensions to a sway in the Government of England, and to remove his Lord Lieutenant on the first opportunity.

However, it is of little consequence now to speculate; the affair is over, and the breach irreparable. It gives me this opportunity of assuring you how much I feel as you do, and with you, and lament your good interposition had not the effect which it should have had, and would have had, if the benefit of both countries had been considered by any party in England.—I am, my dear Sir, yours most sincerely,

H. GRATTAN.

Some of the observations above apply to the present state of Ireland.

No. 2.

THE History of the Union would be incomplete if the Protests of the Lords were not left upon record. Posterity will read the statements there made, and compare them with the results that followed the measure, and form thereon an impartial and correct opinion.

PROTESTS AGAINST THE UNION.

House of Lords, 1800.

RESOLVED,—That in order to preserve and secure the essential interests of Great Britain and Ireland, and to consolidate the strength, power and resources of the British Empire, it will be advisable to concur in such measures as may best tend to unite the two kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland into one kingdom, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as may be established by acts of the respective Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland.

To which the following Protest was entered on the journals.

10th February, 1800.

DISSENTIENT.

Because, we consider the measure of an incorporate Legislative Union inadmissible; that it exceeds the lines of modification, or even of innovation, leaving in existence no principle of our Imperial Constitution as originally and fundamentally established, save only that of unity of Executive for both kingdoms; that any compact founded upon unity of executive alone, divested of the protection and controul of a distinct, independent, internal legislature, would be *ipso facto* a radical change from a free-balanced Constitution to an absolute Government of Ireland, by the British Parliament, as the relative situation of the respective kingdoms, in whatever point of view considered, renders it impossible for Ireland to derive any benefit from that species of representation on any scale of proportion, which the objects and nature of the Imperial Constitution of the United Kingdoms can admit of. It is unnecessary to state, that the Parliaments of the respective kingdoms as they have stood, and as they do stand, are not only fully competent to, but are the only constitutional organ of, any explanation or adjustment which may be found necessary for ever effectually to remedy or to prevent misconception or misconstruction as to any point whatever. We therefore find ourselves called upon

by our attachment, duty and allegiance to our most gracious Sovereign, by the preservation and maintenance of the just rights and liberties of our country, and by our affection and regard to our sister kingdom, to oppose *in limine*, by every legal means, the dereliction of a Constitution, which during the period of more than six hundred years has withstood the shock of every event; or the adoption of a system which, as it does in no sort apply to the relative situation of either kingdom, could not in its bearings, tendencies, operations and consequences, fail of destroying the inseparable joint interests of both.

BELLAMONT.
BLANEY, by Proxy.

The following Protest was also entered on the journals.

Thursday, February 20th, 1800.

DISSENTIENT.

Firstly. Because the resolution sanctions the principle of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, without an opportunity having been afforded to this House of examining the details which are held out as an inducement for its adoption; details which have occupied the attention of those who have proposed the measure for a considerable length of time, and which, therefore, should not be hastily or without due consideration, acted upon by any branch of the legislature of Ireland.

Secondly. Because those details do not appear to us on such consideration as we have been allowed to give them, to proffer any benefits to this country of which it is not already in possession, or to any remedy for any of the evils which it at present has reason to apprehend.

Thirdly. Because the resolution proposes as a remedy for partial and temporary evils, an act which, if once adopted, binds us and our posterity for ever.

Fourthly. Because we consider the independence of Ireland and the security of her connexion with Great Britain, to be equally essential to the well-being of this country, and that we consider both as endangered by the measure of a Legislative Union.

Fifthly. Because the present constitution of these kingdoms, founded on the complete unity of their executive power, and the perfect distinctness of their legislatures, appears to us as happily contrived as the limited natures of human institutions can admit, to maintain national freedom in both countries, and unalterable connexion between both.

Sixthly. Because the plan proposed, whether it be good or whether it be ill, appears to us to be calculated to effect a total and fundamental change in the constitution of Ireland—a change which ought not to be ventured on without the unequivocal approbation of the informed understanding and resident property of the country, both of which we consider to be averse to the reception of the measure.

Seventhly. Because we consider the present season of innovation ill-adapted for the discussion of new systems of government, more particularly in this country, which has only just escaped from the revolutionary projects of foreign and domestic enemies, and in which the ordinary course of law has been necessarily suspended.

Eighthly. Because, next to the protection of Divine Providence, we hold this country indebted for its preservation from those evils to the vigilance of its resident Parliament, and the loyalty of its resident gentry; the former of whom the proposed measure necessarily removes from the country, and the latter of whom it must operate to withdraw.

Ninthly. Because from the plan laid before us for constituting the Parliament of the United Kingdoms, it is intended that four spiritual and twenty-eight temporal lords shall be added to the British House of Lords, consisting of upwards of three hundred members; and that one hundred representatives for the people of Ireland shall be added to the British House of Commons, consisting of five hundred and fifty-eight members, and that the present entire British Houses of Parliament, with the said additional members, shall form their united Parliament, from which it is evident that the entire power of making laws and imposing taxes, must reside in the preponderating majority of the British members in such Parliament: which power, though it might without danger be entrusted to them if the two nations were to be so perfectly incorporated as to form but one nation, and to have but one purse, as in the union between England, Scotland, and Wales, yet in this intended Union, where distinct revenues, distinct taxes, and distinct expenses, shall continue to exist between the two nations, it must leave the liberties of the Irish nation at the disposal of such British majority who will make the law for the internal regulation of Ireland, which shall not in any sort affect themselves and impose taxes upon that kingdom, the pressure of which they will not feel; it appears to us that the exercise of such powers must necessarily produce universal discontent, and may possibly tend to alienate the affections of Ireland from Great Britain.

Tenthly, and above all. Because we conceive that no scheme of national adjustment can be honourable, satisfactory, or permanent, which is not considered with mature deliberation, pro-

secuted by fair and temperate means, and founded on the uninfluenced sense of Parliament, no one of which essential requisites can we find in the present project.

Leinster.	Massy (by proxy).
Downshire.	Enniskillen.
Pery (by proxy).	Belmore (by proxy).
Meath.	Dillon.
Granard.	Strangford.
Moira (by proxy).	Powerscourt.
Ludlow (by proxy).	De Vesci (by proxy).
Arran.	Wm. Down and Connor.*
Charlemont.	R. Waterford and Lismore.†
Kingston.	Louth.
Mountcashel.	Lismore.
Farnham.	Sunderlin.

Protest.

May 15, 1800.

Dissentient,

Because it is of the utmost importance both to Great Britain and to Ireland that their proportions to the general expenses of the empire should be adjusted according to their respective abilities to discharge them, and it is evident that if Ireland (the weaker nation) shall be charged with a proportion beyond the reach of her ability, the necessary consequence must be that she will become a bankrupt nation: whereby, instead of becoming a powerful assistant to Great Britain, she will be rendered a burthen and incumbrance upon her.

Because the calculation made, both by the British and by the Irish minister, for ascertaining the respective abilities of the two nations, has been founded upon a comparison of the value of the imports and exports of each kingdom, and also upon a comparison of the consumption within the said kingdom respectively of the articles enumerated in the prepared address; and it is not alleged that any official document has even been laid before either House of the Irish Parliament to show what the relative consumption of the said articles has been in the said kingdom. We therefore thought the House called upon, before they should come to a final determination upon so momentous a question, to procure such authentic information as should justify their conduct and enable them to form a proper judgment concerning the apportionment of the expenses to be defrayed by each nation.

Because no possible inconvenience can arise from laying before the House any information which can be procured, and

* Bishop Dickson. † Bishop Marley.

which applies to the subject, and cannot suggest any reason for objecting to the information required, save from an apprehension that by laying it before the House it would tend to prove the calculation adopted for proportioning the expenses to be respectively defrayed by each nation to be erroneous.

Because we consider it beneath the dignity of this House, and the solemnity which the momentous subject under consideration requires, to come to a determination without evidence to support them, but to found them merely upon the representation of individuals, let their rank or abilities be ever so respectable.

GRANARD.
LUDLOW (by proxy).
ARRAN.
STRANGFORD (by proxy).
CHARLEMONT.
KINGSTON (by proxy).
RIVERSDALE (by proxy).
POWERSCOURT.
R. WATERFORD AND LISMORE.†
FARNHAM.
ENNISKILLEN (by proxy).
MASSEY (by proxy).

LORDS' PROTEST AGAINST A LEGISLATIVE UNION WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

June, 1800.

Firstly. Because the measure recommended by our most gracious Sovereign was a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, to be founded upon equal and liberal principles. We cannot help observing that the terms proposed in the said bill are inconsistent with those principles, and are totally unequal; that Great Britain is thereby to retain entire and undiminished her Houses of Lords and Commons, and that two-fifteenths of the Irish peers are to be degraded and deprived of their legislative functions, and that two-thirds of the Irish House of Commons are to be degraded and struck off: such a proceeding appears to us totally unequal, both in respect of numbers and in the mode of forming the united Parliament; and we cannot suggest any reason for reducing the number of the members of the Irish Houses of Parliament which does not apply with more force to reducing the number of the members of the British Houses of Parliament, whose numbers so greatly exceed that of the members of the Irish Houses of Parliament.

Secondly. Because the measure recommended by his Majesty was a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland; by which we understand such a Union as should so perfectly identify the two nations, that they should become as one nation, and there should not exist any distinct interest between them. When we consider the provisions of the said bill, we find that, although its professed object is to form a perfect

* Bishop Mailey.

Union between them, it does not in any sort effect it. It unites the legislatures, but does not identify the nations; their interests will remain as distinct as they are at present. Ireland will continue to be governed by a viceroy, assisted by an Irish privy council; her purse, her revenues, her expenditure, and her taxes will be as distinct as they are at present from those of Great Britain; even their intercourse of trade must be carried on as between two separate nations, through the medium of revenue officers. Such distinctness of interest prove that they require separate Parliaments resident in each kingdom to attend to them; that such Union is only nominal, and that it does not effect that complete and entire Union recommended by his Majesty; but shows that, from the circumstances of the two nations, the same is totally impracticable.

Thirdly. Because the adjustment of the number of the Irish members to be added to the two Houses of the Imperial Parliament has been determined upon without any official documents or other authentic information having been laid before Parliament. That upon the Union with Scotland such proportion was adjusted by the commissioners appointed for England and Scotland, upon an examination of their respective claims, who having thereupon agreed that the number of Commoners to be added to the English Commons (consisting of 513) should be 45 on the part of Scotland; and the number of English peers being then 185, they calculated that 16 bore the same proportion to that number which 45 bore to the English House of Commons, and therefore determined upon that number of peers. This calculation justified the propriety of such adjustment, and we cannot conceive upon what principle the number of Irish peers was reduced to 32, when, according to the proportion aforesaid, it ought to have been 53. We must consider such conduct as unjust in its principle, and wantonly casting a stigma upon the Irish peerage, by depriving 21 of their body of their just right of sitting in the united Parliament.

Fourthly. Because that, however proper it may have been for the two Parliaments to mark out the two great outlines for forming an Union between the two nations, we think that from their situation in different kingdoms, and the impracticability of communication between them, they were ill suited to the adjustment of matters which require detail; that the mode of proceeding adopted by the great Lord Somers, upon the Union with Scotland, of appointing Commissioners on the behalf of each nation, is proved by experience to have been well adapted to the purpose; that such Commissioners having the means of procuring information—and communicating with each other—were thereby enabled to settle with propriety, and to the satisfaction of both nations, such matters as should be necessary to

be adjusted between them; that instead of adopting that wise and rational mode of proceeding, the adjustment of the members to be added to the Imperial Parliament has been established in pursuance of the mandate of the British minister, without laying before Parliament any official document whatsoever, or taking any step to procure information concerning the respective claims of the two nations.

Fifthly. Because by the original distribution of power between the two Houses of Parliament, it has been established as a leading and fundamental principle of the Constitution, that the Commons should hold the purse of the nation without the interference of the Peerage; notwithstanding which, and that the said bill declares, that Irish peerages shall be considered as peerages of the United Kingdom, directs, that Irish peers shall be eligible as Commoners to represent any place in Great Britain; so hereby the purse of the nation will be eventually put into the hands of the peers of the United Kingdom, under the description of Irish peers, in direct defiance of the aforesaid principle; that it is evident that such innovation was introduced by the Minister for the purpose of preventing the opposition which the measure might receive from such Irish peers as were members of the British House of Commons, which is clearly evinced by their not being made eligible for any place in Ireland from whence they derive their honours; that by the provision in the bill for a constant creation of peers for Ireland, the Irish peerage is to be kept for ever, thereby perpetuating the degrading distinction by which the Irish peerage is to continue stripped of all Parliamentary functions; that the perpetuity of such distinction would have been avoided, by providing that no Irish peer should hereafter be created (which is the case of Scotch peers), and that whenever the Irish peers shall be reduced to the number of twenty-eight, they should be declared peers of the United Empire, equally with the British, from which time all national distinctions between them should cease.

Sixthly. Because, when we advert to the corrupt and unconstitutional language held out by the minster to such members as claimed property in boroughs, intimating to them, that they should be considered as their private property, and should be purchased as such, and the price paid out of the public purse, such language appears to us to amount to a proposal to buy the Isish Parliament for Government, and makes the Union a measure of bargain and sale between the minister and the individual.

Seventhly. Because, when we compare the relative abilities of Great Britain and Ireland, we find the contribution to be paid by the two kingdoms, to the expenses of the United Empire, most unequally adjusted, and that the shares of two-seventeenths

fixed upon as the proportion to be paid by Ireland, is far beyond what her resources will enable her to discharge. Should Ireland undertake to pay more than she shall be able to answer, the act will be irrevocable, and the necessary consequence will be a gradual diminution of her capital, the decline of her trade, a failure in the produce of her taxes, and finally, her total bankruptcy. Should Ireland fall, Great Britain must necessarily be involved in her ruin, and we will have to lament that our great and glorious empire will be brought to the brink of destruction, by the dangerous and visionary speculation of substituting a new system of Government for Ireland, in the place of that Constitution which she has experienced to be the firmest security for the preservation of her liberties. We think it proper to observe, that if the ministers had any plausible grounds, whereupon they have calculated the said proportion, they have not deigned to lay them before Parliament, nor have the usual and established forms of proceeding to investigate matters of intricate and extended calculations been resorted to, by appointing committees for their examination, neither have commissioners been appointed, as was done upon the Union with Scotland. Had the minister applied his attention to that very necessary inquiry, of ascertaining the relative ability of the two nations, he would have compared the balance which Great Britain has in her favour, from her trade with all the world, amounting to 14,800,000*l.*, with that of Ireland upon the whole of her trade, amounting to 509,312*l.*, bearing a proportion to each other of about twenty-nine to one. He would have examined into the amount of revenue, out of which the said proportions must naturally be paid, namely, the produce of the permanent taxes of each nation, which he would have found to have produced in Great Britain, in the year ending the 5th of January, 1799, the sum of 26,000,000*l.*, and the permanent taxes of Ireland, in the corresponding year, did not exceed 2,000,000*l.*, bearing a proportion to each other of about thirteen to one. He would have been informed that the only influx of money into Ireland which can be discovered, is the said balance of her trade of 500,000*l.*, and that she remits to Great Britain annually 724,753*l.*, a sum exceeding by upwards of 215,000*l.* the amount of such balance; that the remittances to her absentees (as stated by Mr. Pitt) amount to one million, but are computed really to amount to double that sum, and must necessarily greatly increase, should a Union take place, such drains exhausting in a great degree the resources of this kingdom, and adding to the opulence of Great Britain. The facility with which large sums of money have lately been raised in Great Britain, compared with the unsuccessful attempt to raise so small a sum in this kingdom as one million and a half, would have afforded to him the strongest

proof of the opulence of the one, and the poverty of the other. From the Irish minister's own statement, he has computed that the sum for which this kingdom shall be called upon annually in time of war, as her contribution, will amount to 4,492,680*l.*, but has not attempted to point out the means by which she can raise so enormous a sum. When the minister shall find that the circumstances of Ireland are such as have been herein stated, and shall recollect that this new project has been suggested by him, and forced upon this nation, he will feel the immense responsibility which falls upon him for the disastrous consequences which it may produce, not only upon this kingdom, but upon the whole empire. He will be alarmed at the discontents, which an imposition of taxes beyond the abilities of the people to pay must produce, and the fatal consequences that they may occasion.

Eighth. Because the transfer of our legislature to another kingdom, will deprive us of the only security we have for the enjoyment of our liberties, and being against the sense of the people, amounts to a gross breach of trust; and we consider the substitute for our constitution, namely, the return of the proposed number of persons to the United Parliament, as delusive, amounting, indeed, to an acknowledgment of the necessity of representation, but in no sort supplying it, inasmuch as the thirty-two Peers, and the one hundred Commoners will be merged in the vast disproportion of British members, who will in fact be the legislators of Ireland; and when we consider that all the establishments of the two separate governments are to continue, which must add to the influence of the minister over the conduct of Parliament, and advert to his power in the return of Irish members to Parliament, we conceive that such portion is more likely to overturn the constitution of Great Britain than to preserve our own.

Ninth. Because we consider the intended Union a direct breach of trust, not only by the Parliament with the people, but by the Parliament of Great Britain with that of Ireland, inasmuch as the tenour and purport of the settlement of 1782 did intentionally and expressly exclude the re-investigation of constitutional questions between the two countries, and did establish the exclusive legislative authority of the Irish Parliament, without the interference of any other; that the breach of such a solemn contract, founded on the internal weakness of the country, and its inability at the time to withstand the destructive designs of the minister, must tend to destroy the future harmony of both, by forming a precedent and generating a principle of mutual encroachment in terms of mutual difficulties.

Tenth. Because, that when we consider the weakness of the

kingdom and the time that the measure was brought forward, and her inability to withstand the destructive designs of the minister, and couple to the act itself the means that have been employed to accomplish it; such as the abuse of the Place Bill, for the purpose of modelling the Parliament; the appointment of sheriffs to prevent county meetings; the dismissal of the old stedfast friends of constitutional government for their adhering to the constitution, and the return of persons to Parliament who had neither connexion nor stake in the country, and were, therefore, selected to decide upon her fate. When we consider the armed force of the minister, added to his powers and practices of corruption, when we couple these things together, we are warranted to say, that the basest means have been used to accomplish this great innovation, and that the measure of Union tends to dishonour the ancient peerage for ever, to disqualify both Houses of Parliament, and subjugate the people of Ireland for ever; such circumstances, we apprehend, will be recollected with abhorrence, and will create jealousy between the two nations in the place of that harmony which for so many centuries has been the cement of the Union.

Eleventh. Because the argument made use of in favour of the Union, namely, that the sense of the people of Ireland is in its favour, we know to be untrue, and as the minister has declared that they would not pass the measure against the sense of the people, and as the people have pronounced, and under all difficulties, their judgment against it. We have, together with the sense of the country, the authority of the minister to enter our protest against the project of Union, against the yoke which it imposes, the dishonour which it inflicts, the disqualification passed upon the peerage, the stigma thereby branded on the realm, the disproportionate principle of expenses it introduces, the means employed to effect it, the discontents it has excited and must continue to excite, against all these, and the fatal consequences they may produce, we have endeavoured to interpose our votes; and, failing, we transmit to after times our names, and our solemn protest on behalf of the parliamentary constitution of this realm; the liberty which it secured—the trade which it protected—the connexion which it preserved—and the constitution which it supplied and fortified. This we feel ourselves called upon to do, in support of our characters, our honour, and whatever is left to us worthy to be transmitted to posterity.

LEINSTER.
MEATH.
GRANARD.
MOIRA (by proxy), for 8th, 10th, and 11th reasons.
LUDLOW (by proxy).
ARRAN.
CHARLEMONT.
KINGSTON (by proxy).
RIVERSDALE (by proxy).
MOUNTCASHEL.
FARNHAM.

Belmore (by proxy).	Wm. Down and Connor.
Massy (by proxy).	R. Waterford and Lismore.
Strangford.	Sunderlin, except for the 7th reason.
Powerscourt.	
De Vesci.	Lismore (by proxy).

No. 3.

Protest against the Union, drawn up by Mr. Grattan.

Being an address moved by Lord Corry in the Irish House of Commons, on the 6th of June, 1800.

We, your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Commons of Ireland, at all times sensible of the numerous and essential advantages which we, in common with your subjects in Ireland, have derived under your auspicious reign, beg leave to assure you that none have more impressed the hearts of your Majesty's subjects than the adjustment, at your Majesty's recommendation, entered into by the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland in 1782; thereby forming the most solid compact which can subsist between two countries and a common Sovereign; but the result of that compact and adjustment was the increase of our trade and of our revenue, together with the harmony of the two Parliaments and the support of the connexion. That the said compact, on the part of your Majesty's Parliament of Ireland, has been religiously and beneficially adhered to, insomuch that a final termination of all constitutional questions between the two nations took place, and the commercial points which at that time remained to be settled have since, without agitation or ferment, been gradually and satisfactorily disposed of.

That, under these circumstances, it is with the deepest concern and the greatest surprise we have seen a measure propounded under the name of Union, to set aside the most important and sacred covenant,—to deprive this country of her Parliament in time to come, and in lieu thereof to introduce an innovation consisting of a separate Irish Government without an Irish Parliament, whose power is to be transferred to a British Parliament, without an availing Irish representation therein; an innovation such as may impair and corrupt the constitution of Britain, without preserving the liberties of Ireland; so that this country shall be in time to come taxed without being duly represented, and legislated for by a body out of the realm, incapable of applying proper remedies and remote from the means of knowing her wants, her wishes, and her interests.

That giving the name of Union to the measure is a delusion; the two kingdoms are already united to each other in one common empire,—one in unity of interest and unity of constitution, as has been emphatically pronounced from the throne by your Majesty's former viceroy; bound together by law, and what is more effectual than law, by mutual interest, mutual affection, and mutual duty to promote the common prosperity of the empire; and it is our glory and our happiness that we form an inseparable part of it.

That this Union has stood the test of ages, unbroke by the many foreign wars, civil commotions, and rebellions which have assailed it; and we dread the rash and desperate innovation which now would wantonly and unnecessarily put it to the hazard,—an innovation which does not affect to strengthen the unalterable interest of each country in supporting the revolution that placed your Majesty's illustrious family on the throne; for that interest cannot be increased by any law,—it is implanted in our hearts, it is interwoven with our prosperity, it grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength.

Neither does it profess to create an interest in either country to preserve their connexion together, because that interest already exists, and we know and feel that such connexion includes all that is dear to us and is essential to the common business or to the existence of both nations—we therefore do with all humility implore your royal protection of that Glorious Revolution, and of an impartial connexion against the perseverance of your Majesty's Ministers in their endeavours to force this ruinous measure.

Their avowed object is a Union of the two nations; but the only Union they attempt is a union of the two Parliaments, and the articles which are to attend their partial and defective Union are all so many enumerations of existing distinct interests in the two kingdoms, which it cannot identify, and which require separate Parliaments resident in each, duly to attend to them.

In respect to taxes, the purse of each nation is vested in its own House of Commons by the principles of the constitution; the security of our liberty, and the great constitutional balance of the powers of the state, lie in its being left there; but the articles acknowledge a separate purse, and a separate interest in that purse, by providing for a separate proportion of expense, separate modes and laws of taxation, separate debts, separate sinking funds, separate treasury, separate exchequer, separate accounts of revenue to be kept, and separate articles of produce to be placed in the way of debtor and creditor between the two kingdoms, as between two unconnected parties; and though the state acknowledge and attempt to form regulations for all

these many distinct interests, which no laws can identify or consolidate, and though even the legal interest of money remains different in the two kingdoms without their attempting to assimilate it, yet they take away the Irish Parliament, which these distinctnesses ought rather to have suggested the creation of, if it did not exist, and they lay the foundation of distress, discontent, and jealousies in this kingdom, if not of worse evils, and tend to familiarize the ideas of separation instead of Union, to the utter ruin of this your ancient kingdom and your loyal subjects therein.

In regard to manufactures, they acknowledge the interests in them to be so distinct, that they are forced to provide, in express terms, against a free intercourse being allowed between the two kingdoms in more than twenty general denominations, and they establish countervailing duties on the mutual import of at least twenty-four species of goods, on account of the necessary difference in taxation and the distinctness of revenue which, from the separate interests of the two kingdoms in them, will not admit of consolidation.

On the mutual interchange of corn—that great necessary of life—they not only continue duties, but they provide for retaining prohibitions and bounties; and instead of even alleging an identity of interest in so important and general an article, they avow such separate interests to exist in it as law cannot remove, and an interdict is necessary to be laid on its free communication between two kingdoms, while your Majesty's ministers have at the same time the hardiness to tell us their project is to unite, identify, and consolidate throughout all their interests.

We see with them that these interests are distinct, and we therefore raise up our voices to your Majesty against their impracticable attempt to consolidate them,—an attempt which they themselves acknowledge to be so by their many provisions, all intended to cause a continuance of their distinctness.

But, however separate these interests are in taxes, in revenue, in trade, and in manufactures; and however incapable of being identified, we have the happiness of knowing that in the great point of constitution no difference exists,—both nations have a full right to all the blessings of the British constitution; and we have an identity, not a distinctness of interest, in the possession of it. Yet such is the strange passion of your Majesty's ministers for innovation, that not finding any such distinctness, they do by these articles create several highly alarming to us and to all your Majesty's subjects of this kingdom who claim an equal right with Great Britain in the full and free enjoyment of that constitution.

All the Irish temporal lords, except twenty-eight, are to be incapacitated by this measure from exercising their rights and

duties as peers and hereditary counsellors, while every British temporal lord is to retain his full functions.

Four spiritual lords only are to have a share in the legislature, while all the British spiritual lords are to continue theirs; and two-thirds of the Irish Commoners are to be disqualified, while every British Commoner remains.

The articles further declare that all Irish peerages shall be considered as peerages of the United Kingdom, whereby the Irish peers who are to be incapacitated from legislating as peers are to continue peers, and may legislate as commoners. They are not to represent any place in Ireland, the country from whence they derive their honours, although their voices as commoners will extend equally with that of every other commoner to all the concerns of this kingdom. And thus the Irish purse will be eventually put into the hands of the Irish peerage, in direct defiance of a great and fundamental principle of the constitution.

All these degrading, dangerous, and unconstitutional distinctions are not only created in the Irish peerage, but are to remain for ever, without power of alteration, by a provision being made in the articles for a constant creation of peers for Ireland.

That the Irish peerage is to be kept for ever a distinct body from the British, though the project professes a Union of the two kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, and attempts a union of the two Parliaments, of which the peerage is a constituent part; and this continuance of a separate Irish peerage, stripped as it will be of all parliamentary function, perpetuates a distinction insulting and degrading to this kingdom, which our ministers, if they had solely in view, without any regard to influence, a lasting union of the Parliaments, to which this continuance no way contributes, would have avoided by providing that the Irish peers, when reduced to the proposed number of twenty-eight, should be declared peers of the United Empire equally with the British, and thus would have dissolved all national distinctions between them for the time to come.

But it is not in trade, revenue, and manufactures only, that distinct interests are declared to exist, nor in constitution alone that separate interests are to be created: the same distinctness is to be preserved in the administration of justice,—every difference of law, every variation of practice and of regulation which now prevails, is to be allowed to distinguish the civil and ecclesiastical courts, with this one exception only, that in the ultimate appeal every Irish suitor is to be again at the expense and hazard of going to Westminster, instead of having a court in Dublin to resort to.

We enlarge the more on these several enumerations of sepa-

rate interests, avowed or created by your Majesty's ministers, because the many provisions they propose for their future regulation, are so many acknowledgments that no force of law can identify them, so as to admit of their consolidation; provisions, all in themselves presumptuous and insufficient, inasmuch as it is not in the power of human wisdom to foresee the events of time, and provide now by a system declared immutable, for the varying changes which must naturally take place in the lapse of years.

Under the same conviction, though they profess a union of the two Parliaments, they do not attempt to form out of them, one with equal and common power for both kingdoms; it is to be free in all its functions in respect to Britain, but shackled and bound up by restrictions as to Ireland.

In this they deprive your Majesty's Irish subjects of a Parliament, such only as the British Constitution acknowledges free in its deliberations for every part of the empire it is to legislate for; such as we have a right to enjoy, equally unrestrained in its powers, and unfettered in its proceedings, as to the interests of this your Majesty's kingdom, and such a one, free and independent in all its functions, as we solemnly claimed to be our birthright in 1782, and as your Majesty, in your wisdom and justice, did then graciously confirm to this kingdom for ever, but which claim and gracious confirmation your ministers now seek to take away from the kingdom for ever.

That having thus shown to your Majesty how very inefficient the project of your ministers is, to answer even the purpose it avows, and how very ruinous its operations must be, if you shall not be graciously pleased to interfere; we feel it our further duty to expose fully to your Majesty's view, not only the artful delusions which those ministers have presumed to hold out of supposed advantages in commerce, in revenue, in taxes, and in manufactures, to deceive the people into an approbation of their secheme; but the corrupt and unconstitutional means which they have used, the undue manner in which they have employed the influence of the Crown, and the misrepresentations which they have made of the sense of your Majesty's people of Ireland on the measure.

Were all the advantages, which without any foundation they have declared that this measure offers, to be its instant and immediate consequence, we do not hesitate to say expressly, that we could not harbour the thought of accepting them in exchange for our Parliament, or that we could or would barter our freedom for commerce, or our Constitution for revenue, but the offers are mere impositions, and we state with the firmest confidence, that in commerce or trade their measure confirms no one advantage, nor can it confer any; for by your Majesty's gra-

cious and paternal attention to this your ancient realm of Ireland, every restriction, under which its commerce laboured, has been removed during your Majesty's auspicious reign, and we are now as free to trade to all the world as Britain is.

In manufactures, any attempt it makes to offer any benefit which we do not now enjoy is vain and delusive, and wherever it is to have effect, that effect will be to our injury. Most of the duties on imports, which operate as protections to our manufactures, are, under its provisions, either to be removed or reduced immediately, and those which will be reduced are to cease entirely at a limited time; though many of our manufactures owe their existence to the protection of those duties, and though it is not in the power of human wisdom to foresee any precise time when they may be able to thrive without them.

Your Majesty's faithful Commons feel more than an ordinary interest in laying this fact before you: because they have, under your Majesty's approbation, raised up and nursed many of those manufactures, and by so doing, have encouraged much capital to be vested in them, the proprietors of which are now to be left unprotected, and to be deprived of the Parliament, on whose faith they embarked themselves, their families and properties in the undertaking.

In revenue, we shall not only lose the amount of the duties which are thus to be removed or lowered, and which the papers laid before us by the Lord Lieutenant show to amount to the immediate annual sum of 50,000*l.*, but we shall be deprived of nearly as much more by the annihilation of various export duties, which have subsisted for above a century on other articles of intercourse, without being felt or complained of by us, and this whole revenue of 50,000*l.*, which operated beneficially to our manufacture, and of near 50,000*l.* more which oppressed our manufacture, is to be wantonly given up, without the desire or wish of either nation, at a time when our income is more than ever unequal to our expenses, and when the difficulty of raising new taxes to supply its place is alarmingly increased, by our having been obliged, in this very Session, to impose new burthens to the estimated amount of 300,000*l.* a-year, and we cannot but remark, that in this arrangement, while we give up this revenue of near 100,000*l.* a-year, Great Britain is to give up one not amounting quite to 40,000*l.*, an inequality no way consonant with the impartiality or justice professed by your Majesty's ministers, nor any ways consistent with the comparative abilities of the two countries to replace the loss.

But the imposition of your Majesty's ministers is still more glaring, in their having presumed to fix a proportion of contribution towards the general future expenses, to be observed by the two kingdoms, in the ratio of one part for Ireland, for every seven parts and a half by Britain.

If they had any plausible grounds whereon they calculated this proportion, they have not deigned to lay them before your Parliament, and the usual and established forms of committees, to investigate into matters of such intricate and extended calculation have been superseded by them.

Your Majesty's faithful Commons are satisfied that the calculation is extremely erroneous, and that, on just and fair inquiry into the comparative means of each country, this kingdom ought not and is not able to contribute in anything like that proportion.

They feel it a duty too, to protest most solemnly against any arrangement of taxation on which they have had no documents, or made any inquiry to guide their judgment, and in which they understand no consideration whatever has been had to the different legal interest of money in this kingdom, which causes a disadvantage of 20*l.* per cent. in procuring capital, nor to relative quantity of shipping possessed and used by each country, nor to the export trade in foreign articles, nor to the extent of manufacture for home consumption, nor to the balance of trade which shows the annual increase of the fund it creates to contribute from, in all of which the means of Britain very far exceed the foregoing proportion, and particularly in the balance of trade, which in Ireland amounts to little more than half a million with all the world, but is stated by authority to have amounted to 14,800,000*l.* in Britain, exclusive of an annual influx of money from the East and West Indies, to the amount of four millions to the proprietors resident in Britain, and of two millions from Ireland to the proprietors of Irish estates resident there, and of another million from Ireland for the charges of her debt due in Britain, whereas the only known or visible influx of money into Ireland is the above balance of trade of half a million only, and these two sums of two millions and one million, while they add to the wealth and means of Great Britain, unfortunately take away, in the same amount, from the ability of Ireland.

Thus, had a due investigation been made, and a fair inquiry gone into, with a view to obtain a true knowledge of facts whereon to ground a just calculation, it would have appeared that this proportion for Ireland is not only unjust, but far beyond what it will be in her power to discharge: and the rashness of your Majesty's ministers in hazarding such a measure, is the more to be lamented or wondered at, because should Ireland engage to pay more than she is able to answer, the necessary consequence must be a rapid decrease of her capital, the decline of her trade, a failure in the produce of her taxes, and in the end her total bankruptcy; but under such circumstances, she cannot be alone a bankrupt, and should she fatally become so by an injudicious or avaricious appointment

of constitution, Great Britain must share in her ruin, and our great and glorious empire be brought to the brink of destruction by an innovating attempt to take from Ireland its constitution, and substitute a theoretic, visionary and untried system in its room.

We should, therefore, earnestly supplicate your Majesty to oblige your ministers to defer the measure until a full and satisfactory investigation should be made, if we did not feel that it ought to be entirely relinquished, and that the injuries and dangers attending on it could not be removed by any change of that proportion or reconciled by any modification of detail whatsoever.

Subordinate, however, as the consideration of it is, we cannot omit remarking to your Majesty, that there is cunningly and insidiously annexed to it a provision for its ceasing even within the short period of three years, should the war continue so long, and that when we shall increase our debt, so as that it shall bear the like proportion to the permanent debt of Britain, all the delusive benefit held out by this proportion is to cease, and we are to undergo common taxes with Britain.

We lament that such delusion should be resorted to, it is too palpable not to be seen, and instead of the confidence which ought to attend every arrangement between the two kingdoms, such conduct must excite diffidence and distrust.

This proportion of their respective permanent debts is to be attained by increasing our debt, which we must do,—and by Britain lessening hers, which she is in the actual course of reducing as rapidly at least as that of Ireland increases; the absurdity, therefore, of the position is self-evident, for it says, that Ireland by increasing her debt and its annual charges, will become more wealthy, and more able to bear equal taxes with Britain, but that Britain by decreasing hers will be less able to pay her contribution and can only pay equal taxes.

Another delusion (omitted, however, in the Articles proposed), has been also plausibly offered, still further to deceive your Majesty's subjects of Ireland into an approbation of this destructive measure, and a promise has been authoritatively announced or artfully insinuated by your ministers in this kingdom, that Ireland is to save by it, or that Great Britain is to give her a million a year of revenue in time of war, and half a million a year in time of peace.

But we know that during a war like the present, such a promise is impracticable, and both kingdoms must strain every nerve and draw forth every resource. We seek not to load our sister kingdom unnecessarily by lessening our own burden, and our loyalty forbids us to listen to arguments which offer to save our purse at the expense of Britain; but it is all a delusion, for

we see nothing in the uniting the two Parliaments which can change the course of the war or lessen the total mass of expense of both nations, and we assert most confidently that no gift can be made or saving ensue in our expenses by the Union, however they may be attempted to be increased by the unfounded and unfair proportion ascertained for us to bear of the general expenditure; but were the offer founded, were it effectual and desirable, its advantages rest on the misfortunes of war, and we should feel ourselves unworthy of the trust reposed in us if we could suffer a hope arising from the continuation of such a dreadful calamity, to direct our conduct in any measure, much less in one which calls on us to give up our constitution for ever.

Neither can we look forward to any proposed saving from the Union in peace, for we are not told, nor could we believe it if your Majesty's ministers did tell us, that a bill professing to unite the two kingdoms, inseparably united without a bill, can have an influence on the situation of the affairs of Europe, or that it can allow us, during the next peace, to dispense with keeping up the same military force as during the last, and we are further given to understand, that your Majesty's royal court, and all its establishments, the courts of law, the exchequer, and all the revenue expenses, are to be continued without the Parliament equally as with it. But were the saving practicable, we feel it is our own duty to make it without a Union, and we know that no Parliament can do it for Ireland with the same knowledge, the same efficacy, and the same safety, as the resident Parliament of Ireland.

But it is not only in respect to these delusions held out as to trade and revenue, that we feel it our duty to lay before your Majesty the conduct of your ministers on this measure, we must state the means by which they have endeavoured to carry it. That in the first instance, admitting the necessity of conforming to the sense of Parliament and the people, they took the sense of the Commons, and found that sense to be against it, that they then affected to appeal against the Parliament to the people, at the same time endeavouring by their choice of sheriffs, to obstruct the regular and constitutional mode whereby the sense of the people has been usually collected, that on the contrary, they did use, or abet and encourage the using, of various arts and stratagems, to procure from individuals of the lowest order, some of whom were their prisoners and felons, scandalous signatures against the constitution, that notwithstanding these attempts to procure a fallacious appearance of strength and muster against Parliament, the people have expressed their sentiments decidedly against the Union, and twenty-one counties, at public meetings legally convened, and

also many other counties by petitions signed by the freeholders, and many cities and towns have expressed, either to your Majesty or to this House or to both, their decided and unalterable hostility to this Union, yet your ministers have, as we believe, taken upon them to state to your Majesty and your ministers in Britain, in defiance of all these facts, that the sense of the nation is not averse to the measure. But if there could be any doubt that your Majesty's ministers, in the appointment of sheriffs, did consider how they might obstruct the people in delivering their opinion regarding the Union, that doubt is fully explained by their continuing in office the sheriff of the former year in more than one instance; whence it also appears how decidedly the sense of the country is against this measure, when your Majesty's ministers found it difficult to procure any person to serve the office of sheriff, who was properly qualified and was also a friend to the measure; that finding the sense of the people, as well as the Parliament, to be against it, your Majesty's ministers attempted to change the Parliament itself, and refusing to take the sense of the nation by a general election they procure a partial dissolution, and did so publicly abuse the disqualifying clause in the Place Bill (which was enacted for the express purpose of preserving freedom and independence of Parliament), that by vacating seats under its authority, very many new returns were made to this House for the purpose of carrying it, and thus did they change the Parliament without resorting to the people. That before the ministry had perverted the Place Bill, the sense of Parliament was against their Union, and if that bill had not been so perverted, that sense had remained unaltered; that of those who voted for the Union, we beg leave to inform your Majesty that seventy-six had places or pensions under the Crown, and others were under the immediate influence of constituents who held great offices under the Crown; that the practices of influence above mentioned were accompanied by the removal from office of various servants of the Crown who had seats in Parliament, particularly the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Prime Serjeant, three Commissioners of the Revenue, a Commissioner of Accounts, a Commissioner of Barracks, and the Cursitor of the Court of Chancery, because they would not vote away the Parliament; also by their withdrawing their confidence from others of your Majesty's faithful and able counsellors, for the same reason, that they procured or encouraged the purchase of seats in this house to return members to vote for the Union, also the introduction of persons unconnected with this country to vote away her Parliament; that they have also attempted to prostitute the peerage, by promising to persons, not even Commoners in Parliament, her sacred honours, if they would come into this House

and vote for the Union; and that, finally, they have annexed to their plan of Union an artful device whereby a million and a half of money is to be given to private persons possessing returns, who are to receive the said sum on the event of the Union, for the carrying of which, to such an amount, the said persons are to be paid, and this nation is to make good the sale by which she is thus disinherited of her Parliament, and is to be taxed for ever to raise the whole amount; although if your ministers shall persevere in such a flagrant unconstitutional scheme, and the money is to be raised, it is for the Union, and being, therefore, an imperial concern, ought to be borne in the proportion already laid down for imperial expenses, that is, two-seventeenths by Ireland, and fifteen-seventeenths by Britain; that, under these unconstitutional circumstances, your Majesty's ministers have endeavoured, against the declared sense of the people, to impose upon them a new constitution, subverting the old one.

That when we consider the peculiar situation of this kingdom, with the annual drains of money from it by persons possessing property in it who do not reside, to the estimated amount of at least two millions annually; when we advert to the further inevitable drain of a million a year by the public revenue, to be remitted to Britain for the annual charges of our public debt, and that to countervail these great and tremendous issues of money, amounting to three millions, we have only our general balance of trade, not 600,000*l.* a-year, to set against them; we look with dread of a measure which must, on the one hand, necessarily add to those drains, by adding a new and large portion of our wealthiest fellow-subjects to the present absentees, and which must, on the other hand, decrease that balance, by encouraging and promoting new imports of manufacture in the room of those which will decline here.

We look to it with the more dread, because, notwithstanding the great loans from England, to the amount of six millions in the last three years, we have not been able to counterbalance the existing drains from hence, and the exchange has been, and still continues, regularly and uniformly against us.

And further, because our inability to raise the necessary loans within this kingdom, even to the small extent that has been expected, is unfortunately now too evident; and the continuing to supply our treasury by loans from Britain, though it may afford some temporary relief, will regularly increase the evil.

Your Majesty's ministers, therefore, if they promise to themselves or to the British nation any easement to their own taxes, from the supposed accession of power over our wealth and over our resources, will find themselves most thoroughly disappointed; and if the difficulty of remittance shall increase, the manufac-

turers of Britain, who have hitherto supplied this kingdom, will find the demand for their goods decrease in proportion as that difficulty shall rise.

That we understand one benefit which they hold out from the proposed measure is what your ministers affect to call tranquillizing Ireland; but that when we look to our Parliament, and see with what efficacy and promptness it has contributed to put down the late unfortunate rebellion, how inadequate a Parliament not resident would have been; when we reflect that in a kingdom containing four and a half millions of people, a resident Parliament must possess the quick and authoritative means of giving energy to the executive, which a Parliament in another country cannot have; that the removing the Parliament tends to remove with it from the kingdom those men of large property and influence, of talents and respectability, whose presence is at all times essential to tranquillity, and may at some conjuncture be alone capable of preserving it; that their absence will leave room for political agitators and men of talents, without principle or property, to disturb and irritate the public mind; we tremble for the consequences of a measure at once the most rash and unnecessary that ever was brought forward by any ministers, and at a time most fitted to produce every evil dreaded, and least fitted to promote any one benefit held forth.

That when we consider the time chosen to introduce such a measure, we feel additional repugnance, it being the moment of our weakness and distress, when the country is of course less free to deliver its full and heartfelt sentiments against the illiberality of such an attempt, peculiarly mortifying to those of your Majesty's subjects who had recently exerted themselves in defence of that constitution which they are now called upon to surrender, and at a time, too, when the spirit of innovation is abroad and likely to be much encouraged by the example of your Majesty's ministers in this their proceeding against the ancient liberties of the people, who may be rendered an unprofitable or dangerous part of the British empire, whether in consequence of this Union they become slavish and abject, or restless and dissatisfied.

That when we reflect on the great value of the acts for trying controverted elections, how eminently and effectually they have been framed for preserving the purity of election, without which the purity of Parliament cannot exist; and when we see that your ministers, well knowing the value we set on them, have proposed various means to continue those benefits to us in the few elections which will remain to be held here after the Union, and have withdrawn them all, from their inefficacy and insufficiency, almost as soon as they were proposed, and have now abandoned all hope of framing any, we foresee and dread the

formidable power which the measure of the Union will give to the Minister in all Irish elections, by destroying the beneficial operation of these acts; for the expense, trouble, and delay of trying controverted Irish elections in London, will deter many candidates entitled to be returned from seeking redress; the sheriffs, who are all appointed by the Minister, will in fact nominate the members, and many of them have already obeyed the wishes of the Minister, in endeavouring to stifle the constitutional voice of the people, give us too sure an omen of the conduct which may be expected from them in elections.

That whether we rest on this incontrovertible and self-evident truth, that no Parliament in another kingdom can have the local information or knowledge of the manners, habits, wants or wishes of the nation, which its own Parliament naturally possesses, and which is requisite for beneficial legislation, nor can be supplied with the necessary information, either as promptly or accurately; or whether we look to the clear proofs of that truth, which the progress of this measure has afforded, by your ministers having called to their assistance, in London, the great officers of this kingdom, most likely from their station to give full information for framing their measure; and though all their talents, and all their own information, and what they obtained by letters, while it was pending, were employed for months there, yet when they brought it back a few hours, or rather a few minutes inquiry on the spot, in Dublin, forced them to alter their project in very many articles, complete and perfect as they thought it. We have strong additional reason to feel and to represent the manifest and irrepairable injuries which this kingdom must sustain, by the want of a resident Parliament, and the impossibility of legislation being carried on for it as it ought to be.

Therefore, inasmuch as the measure of a Union is an unnecessary innovation, and innovations at all times hazardous, are rendered peculiarly so now by the awful situation of the times;

Inasmuch too, as far from being an innocent experiment, it is replete with changes injurious to our trade and manufactures and our revenues;

Inasmuch, also, as it destroys our Constitution, which has worked well, and substitutes a new one, the benefits of which we cannot see; but the numerous evils and dangers of which are apparent, and which, in every change it offers, militates against some known and established principle of the British Constitution;

Inasmuch, also, as it so far endangers the Constitution of Britain, as not to leave us the certainty of enjoying a free Constitution there when our own shall be destroyed.

Inasmuch as it tends to impoverish and subjugate Ireland, without giving wealth or strength to Britain;

Inasmuch as it tends to raise and perpetuate discontent and jealousies, to create new and strengthen old distinctnesses of interests in our concerns of trade, manufactures, revenue, and Constitution, and, instead of increasing the connexion between the two kingdoms, may tend to their separation, to our consequent ruin, and to the destruction or dismemberment of the Empire;

Inasmuch as it endangers, instead of promoting or securing, the tranquillity of Ireland, as it degrades the national pride and character, debases its rank from a kingdom to that of a dependent province, yet leaves us every expense and mark of a kingdom but the great essential one of a Parliament;

Inasmuch as it has been proposed, and hitherto carried, against the decided and expressed sense of the people, notwithstanding the improper means resorted to to prevent that sense being declared, and to misrepresent it when known;

Inasmuch as it is not grounded in all its intricate and momentous parts, on that solemn and full investigation which ought to attend every measure of great moment, and has been introduced and conducted with various delusions and impositions, and with an unbecoming and suspicious haste;

Inasmuch as it provides for sending one hundred of the present representatives to legislate in another kingdom, though elected only to sit in the Parliament in this, and does not give the people an opportunity, by a new election, to exercise their discretion in a new choice of persons, for such a new, altered, and increased trust;

Inasmuch as it leaves to be determined, by the chance of drawing lots, the choice of thirty-two members to represent as many great cities and towns, with a levity which tends to turn into ridicule the sacred and serious trust of a representative, and while it commits to one person the office, which the Constitution commits to two, of speaking the voice of the people and granting their money, it does not allow the electors to choose which of the two they will entrust with that power;

And inasmuch as means the most unconstitutional, influence the most undue, and bribes openly avowed have been resorted to, to carry it against the known sense of the Commons and people during the existence of martial law throughout the land;

We feel it our bounden duty to ourselves, our country, and our posterity, to lay this our most solemn protest and prayer before your Majesty, that you will be graciously pleased to extend your paternal protection to your faithful and loyal subjects, and to save them from the danger threatened by your Majesty's ministers in this their ruinous and destructive project, humbly

declaring, with the most cordial and warm sincerity, that we are actuated therein by an irresistible sense of duty, by an unshaken loyalty to your Majesty, by a veneration for the British name, by an ardent attachment to the British nation, with whom we have so often declared we will stand or fall, and by a determination to preserve for ever the connexion between the two kingdoms, on which the happiness, the power, and the strength of each irrevocably and unalterably depend.

No. 4.

THE Sheriffs declined to comply with the requisitions of the freeholders of the following counties to petition against the Union :—

King's County.
Leitrim.
Roscommon.
Tipperary.
Queen's County (Edward Burrowes Sheriff).
Westmeath.

The following individuals signed petitions against the Union, and their names will descend respected to posterity :—

ARMAGH COUNTY.

Belmore, Earl.
Charlemont, Earl.
Maxwell, Earl.
Brownlow, William.
Macartney, Sir John.
Molyneux, Sir Capel.
Richardson, William.

CLARE COUNTY.

Fitzgerald, R. J.
Hickman, Thomas.
Maunsell, William.
O'Brien, Edward.
Macnamara, Francis.

CORK COUNTY.

Lismore, Viscount.
Mount Cashell, Earl.
De Vesci, Viscount.
Riversdale, Viscount.
Beamish, W.
Kelly, John.
Beecher, Lionel.
Latouche, John.
Latouche, John, Jun.
Latouche, Robert.
Latouche, Peter (Belview).
Latouche, W. D.
Leader, Nicholas Philpot.
Mathew, M., M.P.
Ponsonby, George, M.P.
Ponsonby, W. H.
St. Leger, Boyle.

GALWAY COUNTY,

Clonbrock, Viscount.
Bellew, C. D.
Caufield, St. George.
Daly, Denis Bowes.
French, Hon. Thomas.
Kirwan, Edward.
Moore, G. O.
Nugent, William.
O'Donnell, Sir Neal.
St. George, Charles.

LEITRIM COUNTY.

Granard, Earl of.
La Touche, John.
La Touche, Peter.

LIMERICK CITY.

De Vesci, Viscount.
Hussey, Viscount.
Wolfe, John.
Vereker, Charles.

TIPPERARY COUNTY.

Clonbrock, Viscount.
Lismore, Viscount.
Mount Cashel, Earl.
Maxwell, Viscount.
Armstrong, William Henry.
Bagwell, William.
Hussey, Hon. John.
Osborne, Thomas.
Ponsonby, C. B.

The following individuals signed petitions or resolutions in favour of the Union. Their names are here set forth in order that posterity may affix upon them the brand appropriate for such as part with the liberties of their country.

ARMAGH COUNTY.

Armagh, W. (Archbishop.)
Carleton, Lord (Judge).
Cremorne, Viscount.
Gosford, Earl (Governor).
*Lifford, Viscount.
Ossory, H. (Bishop).
*Sandwich, Earl.
Brien, A. C.
Corry, P. H. G.
Jocelyn, Hon. P.
Stewart, Robert.
*Salis, Peter De.

MAYO COUNTY.†

Altamont, Viscount.
Clanricarde, Earl.
Glentworth, Viscount.
Killala, John (Bishop).
Kilmorry, Viscount.
Mayo, Earl.
Tuam, William (Archbishop).
Tyrawly, Lord.
Yelverton, Viscount (Chief Baron).
Bingham, John.
Brabazon, Anthony.
Browne, Denis.
Cuffe, James.
Jackson, George.
Lindsey, Thomas.

† This address stated that they looked forward to the connexion with the utmost anxiety, confidently hoping (*by putting an end to all factious and religious animosities, and reconciling the people of Ireland to each other*) to secure full enjoyment of all the equal blessings that flow from harmony among their fellow-subjects! Such was the expressed wish of the people who signed in favour of the Union. How this wish was realized history tells; when civil and religious hostilities and the bitterest animosities were sedulously kept up for half a century after.

Meath County.

Bective, Earl.
Boyne, Lord.
*Cork, Lord.
Conyngham, Earl.
*Darnley, Earl.
Drogheda, Earl (Governor).
Dublin, R. (Archbishop.)
Dunboyne, Lord.
*Essex, Earl.
Fingall, Earl.
Gormanston, Viscount.
Meath, T. J. (Bishop.)
*Middleton, Earl.
Netterville,
*Sheffield, Earl.
*Southampton, Earl.
*Sherborne, Earl.
Tuam (Archbishop).
*Wellesley, Marquis.
Wicklow, Earl.
Bligh, Hon. Edward.
Bligh, Thomas.
Burke, Hon. and Rev.
Burton, Hon. P.
De Bath, M.
Dillon, Hon. B.
Nicholson, C. A.
Nugent, Major-General.
O'Neil, Hon. J.
O'Reiley, Sir Hugh.
Plunket, Hon. R.
Plunket, S. (Roman Catholic Bishop.)
Pepper, Thomas.

Westmeath County.

Belvidere, Earl,
Longford, Earl.
Meath, T. S. (Bishop.)
Westmeath, Earl (Governor).
Blaquiere, C. John.
Handcock, William.
Lill, Godfrey.
O'Reiley, Hugh.
Reynell, Richard.
Tuite, Henry.
Pakenham, Thomas.
Pakenham, Edward.
Pennefather, William.
Wood, Henry.

* The number of absentee and English landed proprietors is remarkable.

The following individuals signed an address to the Sheriff of the county, requesting of him not to call a meeting of his county to petition against the Union :—

Tipperary County.

Caher, Viscount (Governor).
Callan, Lord.
Cashell, Charles (Archbishop).
Clare, Earl of (Lord Chancellor).
Desart, Earl.
Dorchester, Earl.
Donoughmore, Lord.
Hawarden, Viscount (Governor).
Killaloe, Wm. (Bishop.)
Llandaff, Viscount (Governor).
Ormond, Earl.
Ossory, Earl.
Roden, Earl.
Toler, John (Attorney-General).

On the first day of the session of 1800 (15th January) new writs were ordered for the following places, the members having accepted offices under the Crown :—

Ballynakill, Hon. M. Matthew.
Bannow, Robert Shaw.
Belfast, George Cruikshank and Wm. Hamilton.
Clonmines, Henry Lutterell.
Cork City, Lieut.-Col. Longfield.
Dingle O'Couch, Wm. Mansell.
Doneraile, Hon. B. St. Leger.
Duleek, C. M. Ormsby.
Ennis, J. D. Vandeleur.
Enniscorthy, Robert Cornwall.
Fethard, G. R. Read.
Granard, J. F. Littleton.
Johnstown, Lorenzo Moore.
Kells, Robert Taylor.
King's County, Maurice Fitzgerald.
Kilbeggan, Sir F. Hopkins.
Knocktopher, Sir J. Shea.
Naas, Hon. F. Hutchinson.
Philipstown, Robert Crowe.
Portarlington, Francis Knox.
Tuam, Hon. W. Yelverton.
Wexford, James Boyd.
Youghal, Robert Uniacke.

On the 23rd the following accepted the nominal office of Escheatorship :—

Carrick, Wm. Gore and Nathaniel Sneyd.
Clogher, Sir Jonah Barrington.
Hillsborough, Robert Johnson.
Monaghan, Wm. Fortescue.

The following places petitioned against the Union. The counties so marked (*) the sheriffs refused to convene.

COUNTIES.

Armagh.*
Carlow.*
Cavan.
Clare.
Donegal.
Down.
Dublin.
Fermanagh.
Galway.
Kildare.
Kilkenny.
King's County.*
Leitrim.*
Limerick.
Longford.
Louth.
Mayo.
Meath.*
Monaghan.*
Queen's County.*
Roscommon.*
Sligo.
Tipperary.*
Tyrone.
Westmeath.*
Wexford.
Wicklow.

CITIES AND TOWNS.

Belfast.
Carlow.
Carrickfergus.
Cork.
Limerick.
Maryborough.
Newry.
Portarlington.

CITIES AND TOWNS—*Continued.*

Downpatrick.
Drogheda.
Drogheda Corporation.
Dublin.
Dublin Corporation.
Kilkenny.
Waterford.

Belbriggan Manufactory.
Boucher's Manufactory.
Orr's Manufactory.

Addresses came from the following places in favour of the Union :—

Antrim, inhabitants of the county.
Belfast, corporation.
Carrick-on-Suir, inhabitants of town.
Clare, inhabitants of county.
Coleraine, inhabitants of town.
Donegal, inhabitants of county.
Dromore, bishop, clergy, and diocese of.
Dundalk, corporation of.
Galway, high sheriff and inhabitants of county.
Galway, inhabitants of town.
Kilkenny, inhabitants of city.
Lifford, inhabitants of town.
Leitrim, undersigned of county.
Limerick, bishop and clergy of.
Londonderry, undersigned of county.
Londonderry, undersigned of city.
Longford, Roman Catholics of county.*
Tipperary, high sheriff and freeholders of county.
Tyrone, high sheriff and freeholders of county.
Wexford, high sheriff and freeholders of county.
Wexford, Roman Catholics of town.
Waterford, Roman Catholics of city
Youghall, undersigned of town.

* In his reply to their address, Lord Cornwallis (Lord-Lieutenant) says, "The Union can alone heal the dissensions and secure the peace, order, and prosperity of this distracted country." In half a century these promises have not been realized, and appear as far off as ever.

No. 5.

LETTER FROM LORD GRENVILLE TO THE EARL OF FINGAL.

Camelford House, January 22, 1810.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to address this letter to your lordship, in reply to that which I received from you respecting the petition with which you are charged. This form of communication I consider as most satisfactory to your lordship. It is also best calculated to do justice to the sentiments of some of the most distinguished advocates of your cause, in concurrence with whom the decision has been taken.

I must, in the first place, assure your lordship, that my opinion remains unchanged as to the object of your petition. It would, I think, be an act of undeniable wisdom and justice, to communicate to our fellow-subjects professing the Roman Catholic Religion, the full enjoyment of our civil constitution. Such a

measure, accompanied by suitable arrangements maturely prepared and deliberately adopted, would, I am confident, above all others, give strength and union to the Empire, and increased security to its religious and civil establishments.—Your lordship is well aware, that on this conviction only have I supported it. To these establishments I am unalterably attached; their inviolable maintenance I have ever considered as essential to all the dearest interests of my country. But they rest, I am certain, on foundations much too firm—they are far too deeply rooted in the affections of that community to which they dispense the blessings of religion, order, and liberty, to require the adventitious and dangerous support of partial restrictions, fruitful in discontent, but, for security, wholly inefficient.

With respect to the present application to Parliament, I knew not, except from public report, that such a measure was in contemplation; or that it was the wish of the petitioners to place their petition in my hands.

I have twice already, at the request of the Catholics of Ireland, moved the House of Lords to take this subject into consideration. I did not, in either case, think myself responsible for your determination as to the time of agitating the question; a determination which, in the first instance, I had not suggested, and which in the last I had in my place in Parliament publicly dissuaded. Recent events had in both cases imposed upon me a peculiar duty, not merely for my own honour, but in justice also to your cause, to prove, by my conduct, on the earliest occasion afforded by yourselves, that no change of public situation, no prejudice, no calumny, no clamour could either vary or suppress my opinions on this great national question. This duty I willingly performed. Deeply impressed with the importance of the measure which I recommended, I have spared no sacrifice, omitted no exertion, by which I could contribute to their accomplishment. And if I could now deceive myself with a hope, that a renewal of my weak efforts, in the present moment, could expedite or facilitate their ultimate success, it would be my highest gratification once more to stand forward as the chosen advocate of national conciliation.

Circumstanced as this question now is, both in England and in Ireland, it is, on the contrary, my deliberate opinion, that no motion grounded on your petition could at this time, in any hands, certainly not in mine, be brought forward, without great and permanent disadvantage to its object.

This opinion is founded, not only on the present known dispositions of Government and Parliament, but also on the unexpected difficulties which have arisen in Ireland, on the impressions which they may create, and the embarrassments which they unavoidably produce.

It would be an invidious task for me to recapitulate, in this place, the transactions of the last three years, or to discuss the temper and spirit, the language and the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers towards your body; nor would it become me to censure, though I may be permitted to lament, the decisions of the Legislature.

To these two topics it is sufficient briefly to have adverted. The obstacles which, in the present moment, they oppose to any favourable consideration of your cause, and the advantages which they afford to the misrepresentations of your adversaries, are too obvious to require explanation.

Many circumstances compel me to speak to your Lordship more at large of the recent proceedings in Ireland; with reference both to their origin and to their consequences. For this purpose I must beg leave to recall to your lordship's recollection, the grounds on which the consideration of these petitions has uniformly been recommended to Parliament. That which you have asked, and which has been supported by the greatest statesmen of our time, now no more, is not in its nature a single or unconnected measure. Its objects are the peace and happiness of Ireland, and the union of the empire in affection, as well as in government. Vain indeed would be the hope of accomplishing such purposes solely by the repeal of a few remaining disqualifications, which, by a strange anomaly, are still left subsisting amidst the ruins of a whole code of proscription. To impute to you this visionary pretension has been the artifice of your opponents. The views of your friends have been more enlarged.

With the just and salutary extension of civil rights to your body must be combined, if tranquillity and union be our object, other extensive and complicated arrangements. All due provision must be made for the inviolable maintenance of the religious and civil establishments of this united kingdom. Much must be done for mutual conciliation—much for common safety; many contending interests must be reconciled, many jealousies allayed, many long cherished and mutual destructive prejudices eradicated.

Such, at least, have always been my own declared opinions. When this matter was last under the consideration of Parliament, I had occasion to dwell, with particular earnestness, on this necessity; I invited the suggestions of others for providing for it; and I enumerated several measures, which eight years before had been in the contemplation of Government, in conjunction with which I then cherished the vain hope of rendering this great service to my country.

Among these measures, I pointed out the proposal of vesting in the crown an effectual negative on the appointment of your bishops. That suggestion had been previously brought forward in the House of Commons, to meet the just expectations, not of

any bigoted or interested champions of intolerance, but men of the purest intentions and most enlightened judgment — men willing to do all justice to the loyalty of your present bishops, yet not unreasonably alarmed at any possibility, by which functions of such extensive influence might hereafter be connected with a foreign interest, hostile to the tranquillity of your country. A danger recently very much increased by the captivity and deposal of the head of your church, by the seizure of his dominions, and by the declared intention of that hostile government to assume in future the exclusive nomination of his successors. The suggestion thus opened to Parliament produced there impressions highly favourable to your cause; it was received as the surest indication of those dispositions, without which all concession must be nugatory, and all conciliation hopeless. To my mind it had been recommended by long reflection. It had formed a part of the original conception of those measures as consequent upon the Union. It was now again brought forward with the concurrence of the two individuals, from whose opinions those generally prevalent among your body might best be inferred; of the agent* of the very persons to whose office it related, and of your lordship, to whom, in addition to every other claim to respect and confidence, the exclusive charge of the petition had recently been committed. What I said on the subject in the House of Lords was spoken in the hearing of both, and I received from both, while the impression was yet recent in your minds, the most gratifying acknowledgments of your satisfaction in all that I had stated.

It was never, I believe, imagined by any of us, that what then passed could be binding on the opinions of the petitioners. The Roman Catholics of Ireland are not a corporate body. They speak through no common organ. Their various wishes and interests, like those of their fellow-subjects, can be collected only from general information; and any opinions, erroneously attributed to them, they, like all other persons, are fully entitled to disclaim.

I learned, however, with deep and heartfelt regret, the subsequent proceedings which took place in Ireland, in consequence of this suggestion. To discuss the grounds of those proceedings would be foreign from my present purpose. Their effect obviously must be, not only to revive expiring prejudices, but to clog with fresh embarrassment every future consideration of any of the measures connected with your petitions. To myself unquestionably the difficulty of originating at this time any fresh discussion of those measures, does, in such circumstances, appear almost insuperable.

Let me not, however, be misunderstood. When I speak of the necessity of combining with the accomplishment of your

* Dr. Milner.

wishes provisions of just security to others, I am no less desirous of consulting every reasonable apprehension on your part.

To the forms, indeed, of these securities, or to the particular details of the proposed arrangements, I attach comparatively little importance. A pertinacious adherence to such details, in opposition even to groundless prejudice, I consider as the reverse of legislative wisdom. I look only to their substantial purposes; the safety of our own establishments, the mutual good-will of all our fellow-subjects, and the harmony of the United Kingdom.

That adequate arrangements may be made for all these purposes, consistently with the strictest adherence, on your part, to your religious tenets, is the persuasion which you have long been labouring to establish, and of which I have uniformly professed my own conviction.

Were it otherwise, I should indeed despair. But that these objects may be reconciled, in so far at least as respects the appointment of your bishops, is known with undeniable certainty. It is proved by the acquiescence of your church, in similar arrangements under other governments, by the sentiments which many of yourselves still entertain as to the proposal suggested in 1808, and, most of all, by the express consent formerly given to that proposal, in a declaration signed by the most considerable of your own bishops.

I see, therefore, in the present state of this subject, much unexpected embarrassment, and many difficulties which renewed discussion in the present moment must, instead of smoothing, inevitably aggravate. There is, however, no ground for ultimate discouragement. The sentiments of reciprocal confidence, the spirit of mutual conciliation, would surmount far greater obstacles.

But nothing, permit me to remark it, can in the mean time be more injurious to your cause, than any attempt, by partial and precipitate decisions, to prejudge its separate branches, or to limit its unreserved discussion. No cause can be more grateful to your opponents, none more embarrassing to your supporters.

To Parliament, when any more favourable conjuncture for this discussion shall arise, every information may probably be supplied, every wish imparted, every apprehension communicated.—There only, by a systematic and comprehensive arrangement of this extensive subject, can all its difficulties be surmounted, all its relations finally adjusted. To be effective and permanent, such an arrangement must be mutually satisfactory.

This is alike the interest of every member of the British Empire, but to none more important than to the Catholics of Ireland. The stability of all your civil rights, both of those which you already enjoy, and of those to which you seek to be admitted, essentially depends on the tranquillity and harmony of your

country, on banishing from it every hostile influence, and composing all its internal differences.

These opinions I have expressed to your lordship with the freedom of a tried and zealous advocate of your cause. On these grounds alone I have ever attempted to do justice to it. To have argued it on any other would have been a dereliction of my own principles.

I need hardly add that, by the same principle, my present conduct must equally be directed. Should the petitioners continue to entertain the desire conveyed in your Lordship's letter, that I should lay this petition upon the table of the House of Lords, with that request I cannot hesitate to comply. It would be highly improper to deny to such a body of men the opportunity of submitting, through my hands, if they should so desire it, and at their own time, their wishes to the Legislature of their own country. It would be still more inexcusable in a case where all my opinions and all my wishes are favourable to the object of their application. On the measure itself, if any motion respecting it be originated by others, I shall not fail to urge, with unabated earnestness, all the same sentiments which I have detailed in this letter. But I must with equal explicitness decline to be myself, at this time, and under so many circumstances of such peculiar disadvantage to your cause, the mover of any such proposition. I am satisfied that, by this decision, I shall best promote the ultimate success of that great work which I have long laboured to accomplish. My reasons for this persuasion, I have, I trust, sufficiently explained.—They may be erroneous, they are at least sincere.

To the principle of equal laws, to the object of national conciliation, I am invariably attached. By me they shall never be abandoned. But any personal exertions which I can make for purposes of such inestimable benefit to my country, must ever be regulated by that discretion, which I am equally determined in every situation to reserve unfettered by previous engagements, and the faithful exercise of which my public duty imperatively forbids me to relinquish.—I have the honour to be, with sincere respect and regard, my lord, your lordship's most obedient humble servant,

GRENVILLE.

No. 6.

THE REGENT'S LETTER.

Carlton House, February 4, 1811.

The Prince of Wales considers the moment to be arrived, which calls for his decision with respect to the persons to be employed by him in the administration of the Executive Government of

the country, according to the powers vested in him by the Bill passed by the two Houses of Parliament, and now on the point of receiving the sanction of the Great Seal.

The Prince feels it incumbent upon him, at this precise juncture, to communicate to Mr. Perceval his intention not to remove from their stations those whom he finds there, as his Majesty's official servants. At the same time the Prince owes it to the truth and sincerity of character, which, he trusts, will appear in every action of his life, in whatever situation placed, explicitly to declare, that the irresistible impulse of filial duty and affection to his beloved and afflicted father, leads him to dread that any act of the Regent might, in the smallest degree, have the effect of interfering with the progress of his Sovereign's recovery.

This consideration alone dictates the decision now communicated to Mr. Perceval.

Having thus performed an act of indispensable duty, from a just sense of what is due to his own consistency and honour, the Prince has only to add, that, among the many blessings to be derived from his Majesty's restoration to health, and to the personal exercise of his Royal functions, it will not, in the Prince's estimation, be the least, that that most fortunate event will at once rescue him from a situation of unexampled embarrassment, and put an end to a state of affairs, ill calculated, he fears, to sustain the interests of the United Kingdom in this awful and perilous crisis, and most difficult to be reconciled to the genuine principles of the British Constitution.

MR. PERCEVAL'S ANSWER.

Downing Street, February 11, 1811.

Mr. Perceval presents his humble duty to your Royal Highness, and has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Royal Highness's letter of last night, which reached him this morning.

Mr. Perceval feels it his duty to express his humble thanks to your Royal Highness, for the frankness with which your Royal Highness has condescended explicitly to communicate the motives which have induced your Royal Highness to honour his colleagues and him with your commands for the continuance of their services, in the stations entrusted to them by the King. And Mr. Perceval begs leave to assure your Royal Highness, that, in the expression of your Royal Highness's sentiments of filial and loyal attachment to the King, and of anxiety for the restoration of his Majesty's health, Mr. Perceval can see nothing but additional motives for their most anxious exertions to give satisfaction to your Royal Highness in the only manner in which it can be given, by endeavouring to promote your Royal Highness's views for the security and happiness of the country.

Mr. Perceval has never failed to regret the impression of your Royal Highness, with regard to the provisions of the Regency Bill, which his Majesty's servants felt it to be their duty to recommend to Parliament. But he ventures to submit to your Royal Highness, that whatever difficulties the present awful crisis of the country and the world may create in the administration of the Executive Government, your Royal Highness will not find them in any degree increased by the temporary suspension of the exercise of those branches of the Royal prerogatives, which has been introduced by Parliament in conformity to what was intended on a former similar occasion; and that whatever Ministers your Royal Highness may think proper to employ, would find in that full support and countenance which, as long as they were honoured with your Royal Highness's commands, they would feel confident that they would continue to enjoy ample and sufficient means to enable your Royal Highness effectually to maintain the great and important interest of the United Kingdom.

And Mr. Perceval humbly trusts, that, whatever doubts your Royal Highness may entertain with respect to the Constitutional propriety of the measures which have been adopted, your Royal Highness will feel assured, that they could not have been recommended by his Majesty's servants, nor sanctioned by Parliament, but upon the sincere though possibly erroneous convictions that they in no degree trenched upon the true principles and spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. Perceval feels it his duty to add that he holds himself in readiness, at any moment, to wait upon your Royal Highness, and to receive any commands with which your Royal Highness may be graciously pleased to honour him.

No. 7.

FROM HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE REGENT TO THE DUKE OF YORK.

Carlton House, February 13, 1812.

MY DEAREST BROTHER,—As the restrictions on the exercise of the royal authority will shortly expire, when I must make my arrangements for the future administration of the powers with which I am invested, I think it right to communicate those sentiments which I was withheld from expressing at an earlier period of the session, by my warmest desire that the expected motion on the affairs of Ireland might undergo the deliberate discussion of Parliament, unmixed with any other consideration.

I think it hardly necessary to call your recollection to recent circumstances, under which I resumed the authority delegated to

me by Parliament. At a moment of unexampled difficulty and danger, I was called upon to make a selection of persons to whom I should intrust the functions of the Executive Government; my sense of duty to our Royal Father solely decided that choice, and every private feeling gave way to considerations which admitted of no doubt or hesitation. I trust I acted in that respect as the general representative of the august person whose functions I was appointed to discharge; and I have the satisfaction of knowing, that such was the opinion of persons for whose judgment and honourable feelings I entertained the highest respect in various instances, as you well know. When the law of the last session left me at full liberty, I waived any personal gratifications, in order that his Majesty might resume, on his restoration to health, every power and prerogative belonging to his Crown. I certainly am the last person in the kingdom to whom it can be permitted to despair of our Royal Father's recovery. A new era is now arrived, and I cannot but reflect with satisfaction upon the events which have distinguished the short period of my restricted Regency. Instead of suffering in the loss of her possessions by the gigantic force which has been employed against them, Great Britain has added most important acquisitions to her empire. The national faith has been preserved inviolably towards our allies; and if character be strength, as applied to a nation, the increased and increasing reputation of his Majesty's arms will show to the nations of the Continent how much they may still achieve, when animated by a glorious spirit of resistance to a foreign yoke. In the critical situation of the war in the Peninsula, I shall be most anxious to avoid any measure which may lead our allies to suppose that I mean to depart from the present system. Perseverance alone can achieve the great object in question; and I cannot withhold my approbation from those who have honourably distinguished themselves in support of it. *I have no predilection to indulge, no resentments to gratify*, no objects to attain, but such as are common to the whole empire. If such is the leading principle of my conduct,—and I can appeal to the past as evidence of what the future will be,—I flatter myself I shall meet with the support of Parliament, and of a candid and enlightened nation.

Having made the communication of my sentiments in this new and extraordinary crisis of our affairs, I cannot conclude without expressing the satisfaction I should feel if some of those persons with whom the early habits of my public life were formed, would strengthen my hands, and constitute a part of my Government. With such support, and aided by a vigorous and a united Administration, formed on the most liberal basis, I shall look with additional confidence to a prosperous issue of the

most arduous contest in which Great Britain was ever engaged. You are authorized to communicate those sentiments to Lord Grey, who, I have no doubt, will make them known to Lord Grenville. I am always, my dear Frederick, your ever affectionate brother,

(Signed) GEORGE, P. R.

P. S.—I shall send a copy of this letter immediately to Mr. Perceval.

LORDS GREY AND GRENVILLE'S ANSWER.

February 15, 1812.

SIR,—We beg leave most humbly to express to your Royal Highness our dutiful acknowledgments for the gracious and condescending manner in which you have had the goodness to communicate to us the letter of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, on the subject of the arrangements to be made for the future administration of the public affairs; and we take the liberty of availing ourselves of your gracious permission to address to your Royal Highness, in this form, what has occurred to us in consequence of that communication. The Prince Regent, after expressing to your Royal Highness, in that letter, his sentiments on various public matters, has, in the concluding paragraph, condescended to intimate his wish that some of those persons with whom the early habits of his public life were formed "would strengthen his Royal Highness's hands, and constitute a part of his Government." And his Royal Highness is pleased to add, "that with such support, aided by a vigorous and united Administration, formed on the most liberal basis, he would look with additional confidence to a prosperous issue of the most arduous contest in which Great Britain has ever been engaged." On the other part of his Royal Highness's letter we do not presume to offer an observation, but in the concluding paragraph, in so far as we may venture to suppose ourselves included in the gracious wish which it expresses, we owe it, in obedience and duty to his Royal Highness, to explain ourselves with frankness and sincerity. We beg leave most earnestly to assure his Royal Highness, that no sacrifices, except those of honour and duty, could appear to us too great to be made, for the purpose of healing the divisions of our country, and uniting both the Government and its people. All personal exclusion we entirely disclaim; we must rest on public measures, and it is on this ground alone that we must express, without reserve, the impossibility of our uniting with the present Government; our differences of opinion are too many and too important to admit of such a union. His Royal Highness will, we are confident, do us the justice to remember, that

we had twice already acted on this impression—in 1809, on the proposition made to us under his Royal Highness's authority; and last year when his Royal Highness was pleased to require our advice respecting the formation of a new government. The reasons which we then humbly submitted to him are strengthened by the increasing dangers of the times; nor has there, down to this moment, appeared even any approximation towards such an agreement of opinion in the public interest, as can alone form a basis for the honourable union of the parties previously opposed to each other. Into the detail of these differences, we are unwilling to enter; they embrace almost all the leading features of the present policy of the empire. But his Royal Highness has himself been pleased to advert to the late deliberations of Parliament on the affairs of Ireland. This is a subject above all others important in itself, and connected with the most pressing dangers. Far from concurring in the sentiments which his Majesty's Ministers have, on that occasion, so recently expressed, we entertain opinions directly opposite. We are firmly persuaded of the necessity of a total change in the present system of the country, and of the immediate repeal of the disabilities under which so large a portion of his Majesty's subjects still labour, on account of their religious opinions. To recommend to Parliament this repeal is the first advice which it would be our duty to offer to his Royal Highness, could we even for the shortest time make ourselves responsible for any further delay in the prospect of a measure, without which we could entertain no hope of rendering ourselves useful to his Royal Highness or to the country. We have only further to beg your Royal Highness to lay before his Royal Highness the Prince Regent the expression of our humble duty, and the sincere and respectful assurance of our earnest wishes for whatever may promote the ease, honour, and advantage of his Royal Highness's Government, and the successful endeavours for the public welfare. We have the honour to be, &c. &c.,

(Signed) GREY.
GRENVILLE.

To his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

No. 8.

1813.

PARODY OF A CELEBRATED LETTER. BY T. MOORE, ESQ.

AT length, dearest Freddy, the moment is nigh,
When, with Perceval's leave, I may throw my chains by,
And, as time now is precious, the first thing I do,
Is to sit down and write a wise letter to you.

* * * *
* * * *
* * * *
* * * *
* * * *
* * * *

I meant, before now, to have sent you this letter,
But —— Yarmouth and I thought perhaps 't would be better
To wait till the Irish affairs were decided—
That is, till both Houses had prosed and divided,
With all due appearance of thought and digestion,
For though Hertford House had long settled the question,
I thought it but decent, between me and you,
That the two *other* Houses should settle it too.
I need not remind you how cursedly bad
Our affairs were all looking, when father went mad;
A strait waistcoat on him, and restrictions on me,
A more *limited* monarchy could not well be.
I was called upon then, in that moment of puzzle,
To choose my own minister—just as they muzzle
A playful young bear, and then mock his disaster,
By bidding him choose out his own dancing-master.
I thought the best way, as a dutiful son,
Was to do as Old Royalty's self would have done;
So I sent word to say, I would keep the whole batch in
The same chest of tools, without cleansing or patching.
For tools of this kind, like Martinus's Sconce,*
Would lose all their beauty if purified once.
And think, only think, if our father should find,
Upon graciously coming again to his mind,
That improvement had spoiled any favourite adviser,
That Rose was grown honest, or Westmoreland wiser;
That Ryder was even, by one twinkle, the brighter,
Or Liverpool's speeches but half a pound lighter.
What a shock to his old royal heart it would be—
No! far were such dreams of improvement from me.
And it pleased me to find, at the house where you know
There 's such good mutton cutlets and strong curaçoa†
That the Marchioness called me a duteous old boy,
And my Yarmouth's red whiskers grew redder for joy.
You know, my dear Freddy, how oft, if I would,
By the law of last session, I might have done good;
I *might* have withheld these political noodles
From knocking their heads against hot Yankee Doodles.
I *might* have told Ireland I pitied her lot,
Might have soothed her with hope—but you know I did not.
And my wish is, in truth, that the best of old fellows
Should not, on recovering, have cause to be jealous;
But find that, while he has been laid on the shelf,
We 've been all of us nearly as mad as himself.

* The antique shield of Martinus Scriblerus, which, upon scouring turned out to be only an old Sconce.

† The letter-writer's favourite luncheon.

You smile at my hopes—but the Doctors and I
Are the last that can think the king ever will die.
A new era 's arrived—though you 'd hardly believe it,
And all things of course, must be new to receive it.
New villas, new fêtes (which even Waithman attends),
New saddles, new helmets, and why not *new friends*.
I repeat it, "new friends," for I cannot describe
The delight I am in with the Perceval tribe.
Such capering! such vapouring! such rigour! such vigour!
North, South, East, and West, they have cut such a figure,
That soon they will bring the whole world round our ears,
And leave us no friends but—Old Nick and Algiers.
When I think of the glory they 've beamed on my chains,
'T is enough quite to turn my illustrious brains;
It is true we are bankrupts in commerce and riches,
But think how we furnish our Allies with breeches.
We've lost the warm hearts of the Irish 't is granted,
But then we 've got Java, an island much wanted
To put the last lingering few who remain
Of the Walcheren warriors, out of their pain.
Then how Wellington fights, and how squabbles his brother,
For Papists the one, and *with* Papists the other.
One crushing Napoleon by taking a city,
While t' other lays waste a whole Catholic Committee.
Oh! deeds of renown! shall I boggle or flinch
With such prospects before me? by Jove, not an inch.
No—let *England's* affairs go to rack if they will,
We 'll look after th' affairs of the *Continent* still;
And, with nothing at home but starvation and riot,
Find Lisbon in bread, and keep Sicily quiet.
I am proud to declare, I have no predilections,
My heart is a sieve, where some scattered affections
Are just danced about for a moment or two—
And the *finer* they are, the more sure to run through.
Neither have I resentments, nor with these should come ill
To mortal, except (now I think on't) Beau Brummel,
Who threatened, last year, in a superfine passion,
To cut me, and bring the old king into fashion.
This is all I can lay to my conscience at present,
When such is my temper, so neutral, so pleasant,
So royally free from all troublesome feelings,
So little encumbered by faith in my dealings,
(And that I 'm consistent) the world will allow,
What I was at Newmarket the same I am now.
When such are my merits (you know I hate cracking),
I hope, like the vendor of best Patent Blacking,
"To meet with the generous and kind approbation
Of a candid, enlightened, and liberal nation."
By-the-by, e'er I close this magnificent letter—
(No man, except Pole, could have writ you a better).
'T would please if those whom I 've humbugged so long
With the notion (good men!) that I knew right from wrong,
Would a few of them join me—mind only a few—
To let *too* much light in on me never would do.

But even Grey's brightness, sha'n't make me afraid,
While I 've Camden and Eldon to fly to for shade.
Nor will Holland's clear intellect do us much harm
While there 's Westmoreland near him to weaken the charm.
As for Moira's high spirit, if aught can subdue it,
Sure joining with Hertford and Yarmouth will do it.
Between Ryder and Wharton let Sheridan sit,
And the fogs will soon quench even Sheridan's wit;
And against all the pure public feeling that glows,
Even in Whitbread himself we 've a host in George Rose.
So, in short, if they wish to have places they may,
And I 'll thank you to tell all these matters to Grey,
Who, I doubt not, will write (as there 's no time to lose)
By the two-penny post to tell Grenville the news.
And now, dearest Fred (though I have no predilection),
Believe me, yours always, with truest affection.

P.S.—A copy of this is to Perceval going—
Good Lord! how St. Stephens will ring with his crowing!

No. 9.

Address to Mr. Grattan.

Dublin, 8th May, 1812.

Sir,—The Catholic Board should have feebly discharged the duty they owe to the people, with whose confidence they have been honoured, if they had omitted the first opportunity which presented itself, of sending forth to the British empire the warmest expressions of their thanks, for the late splendid and astonishing efforts of their powerful and revered advocate, in the cause of the Catholics of Ireland. Grateful is the task, sir, to be the chosen medium of that feeling which now throbs in every bosom, and swells in every heart.

Grateful is the task to be the organ of that proud and dignifying sentiment which triumphantly claims you the unequalled champion of Irish rights—which now calls you the hope of the British empire, and holds you up to your countrymen as one of those firm and unbending anchors by which that empire is to be steadied in the storm that blows round her. But, sir, doubly grateful is the task to generous minds, of remunerating an age of services by the ardent and passionate homage of the heart, and of putting on the records of our history, the thanks of a calumniated and injured people to him who has devoted gigantic talents, and spotless integrity, to the vindication of their feelings, and the assertion of their rights. Rising in your efforts with the difficulties of your country, you have called back our memories to that glowing period of our history, when every

heart hung with rapture upon your words—when every eye beamed at your name—and every peasant in the land walked firm and erect under the proud feeling your eloquence created. In the enthusiasm of the present moment, we imagine the regeneration of our freedom, and are almost seduced to believe that the genius of Ireland has only extended the circle of her power from a kingdom to an empire. Such is the fascination of an eloquence which at once delights, persuades, and instructs; which is unwearied in the vindication of the injured, and unconquerable in the cause of justice.

In 1792, you told the Irish Legislature and the English secretary, that Catholic Emancipation would enrich the Protestant, and communicate strength and vigour to the empire. The Protestant property of Ireland has more than doubled by the Emancipating Bill of 1793, and the Catholic people of Ireland advanced in numbers, in prosperity, and in character. That country, which for six hundred years was a burden to the English minister, became an ex-fountain of supply—the unclogged industry of Ireland poured forth its offerings of gratitude, and repaid with a miser's profit the blessings of her freedom. Such was the effect of that liberty, of which you were the great and eloquent parent—such the effect of that policy, which you have laboured to preserve and extend. The union, it is true, has thrown down the noble edifice which you had so gloriously erected—and now the question remains to be decided, whether the wisdom of the Imperial Parliament will throw the freedom of the Catholic into the scale against the injuries of the union? But why ask the question? The last struggle—your commanding minority of two hundred and fifteen, has been the victory of reason, of eloquence, and of truth; standing at the head of the Protestant property, of the Protestant rank, of the Protestant character of the British empire, you may securely proclaim the triumph of your favourite muse to an admiring world. Like Fox, your great and immortal predecessor, your last and greatest glory will be the striking off the chains of intolerance from millions of your fellow-creatures.

The children of Ireland yet unborn will be taught to lisp the name of Grattan; and her gratitude, as lasting and as fruitful as her soil, will preserve the memory of that man who for forty years, pleaded her cause with an eloquence unequalled—a spirit undaunted—and a patience unconquered and unconquerable.

The Address was presented by the Earl of Kenmare, Sir Francis Goold, Messrs. Burke, M'Donnell, and Hay. Mr. Grattan returned the following answer:—

Gentlemen,—An address so warm in its expression, to the object of it so honourable; and, when I consider the great body

of the Irish Catholics, so highly respectable, I cannot receive without more than common emotion. It proves the generous and characteristical ardour of my countrymen, and shows by their strenuous and cordial sensations, that they deserve to be defended. I have considered as my first duty the defence of the liberty and character of my country, and have looked to her approbation as my greatest happiness. I have contemplated the civil disabilities as a great public calamity, and have regarded their repeal as a great public blessing.

I think your question has succeeded.

The good sense of the people of both countries, and their disposition to concord have prevailed. To see you in possession of your civil capacities will be the happiest moment of my life. You have deserved them well.

May you obtain them soon—may you enjoy them long, and transfer them to your posterity with undiminished lustre. I have the honour to be, your most faithful humble servant,

HENRY GRATTAN.

London, 6th June, 1812.

No. 10.

DIVISIONS ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Year.	Question.	Members.	For.	Against.	Majority.
1805.	Motion for Committee.	450	124	336	212 against.
1808.	Ditto.	409	128	281	153 against.
1810.	Ditto.	322	109	213	104 against.
1811.	Ditto.	229	83	146	63 against.
1812.	Committee to consider state of the laws.	515	215	300	85 against.
1813.	Ditto.	488	264	224	40 for.
„ March 9.	Resolution in Committee.	305	186	119	67 for.
„ May 11.	Order of day on second reading.	422	235	187	48 for.
„ May 24.	Second reading.	448	245	203	42 for.
„ May 24.	Motion in Committee to omit clause as to sitting in Parliament.	498	247	251	4 against.
1816.	To consider question early next Session.	313	141	172	31 against.
1817.	To consider state of laws.	466	221	245	24 against.
1819.	Ditto.	484	241	243	2 against.

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

CANCELLED

FEB 1 1 1986

Widener Library
3 2044 090 388 927